

VETUS TESTAMENTUM

QUARTERLY PUBLISHED BY THE

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION
OF OLD TESTAMENT SCHOLARS

VOLUME V

EDITORIAL BOARD

G. W. ANDERSON

P. A. H. DE BOER

MILLAR BURROWS

HENRI CAZELLES

E. HAMMERSHAIMB

MARTIN NOTH



LEIDEN

E. J. BRILL

1955

v. 5
1955

Copyright 1955 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands
All rights reserved, including the right to translate or to reproduce
this book or parts thereof in any form

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Articles:

BLAU, J., Etymologische Untersuchungen auf Grund des palaestinishen Arabisch	337
DE BOER, P. A. H., "Vive le Roi!"	225
CARMIGNAC, J., Précisions apportées au Vocabulaire de l'Hébreu biblique par la guerre des fils de lumière contre les fils de ténèbres	345 ✓
CHAMBERLAIN, J. V., The Functions of God as messianic Titles in the complete Qumran Isaiah Scroll	366 ✓
DUPONT-SOMMER, A., Quelques Remarques sur le Commentaire d'Habacuc, à propos d'un livre récent	113
EISSFELDT, O., Zwei verkannte militärtechnische Termini im Alten Testament	232
FOHRER, G., Zum Text von Jes. xli 8-13	239
GRELOT, P., Le Papyrus pascal d'Éléphantine et le problème du Pentateuque	250
HYATT, J. PH., Yahweh as "the God of my Father"	130
MALAMAT, A., Doctrines of Causality in Hittite and biblical Historiography: a parallel	1
MICHAUD, H., Un mythe zervanite dans un des manuscrits de Qumrân	137
MORGENSTERN, J., The Calendar of the Book of Jubilees, its Origin and its Character	34
MOWINCKEL, S., "Psalm criticism between 1900 and 1935" ..	13
PETUCHOWSKI, J. J., "Hoshi'ah na" in Psalm cxviii 25, — a Prayer for Rain	266
v. D. PLOEG, J., La Règle de la Guerre, Traduction et Notes ..	373 ✓
RABIN, C., Notes on the Habakkuk Scroll and the Zadokite Documents	148
RICHARDSON, H. N., Some Notes on לִי and its Derivatives ..	163
ROWLEY, H. H., The Composition of the Book of Daniel...	272
RUBINSTEIN, A., Singularities in consecutive-tense constructions in the Isaiah Scroll	180
SILBERMAN, L. H., The two "Messiahs" of the Manual of Discipline	77 ✓

TEICHER, J. L., The christian Interpretation of the sign x in the Isaiah Scroll	189
THOMSON, J. G. S. S., Sleep: an Aspect of jewish Anthropology	421
WALLENSTEIN, M., A Hymn from the Scrolls	277
WIESENBERG, E., Chronological Data in the Zadokite Fragments	284

Short Notes:

ALLEGRO, J. M., Uses of the semitic demonstrative element z in Hebrew	309
BORGER, R., Mubaqqir Qarbâtîm	434
COUROYER, B., <i>Lbn</i> : chantre?	83
DOBBIE, R., The Text of Hosea ix 8	199
GORDIS, R., The Text and Meaning of Hosea xiv 3	88
JIRKU, A., Zu Psalm lxviii 3a	203
LABUSCHAGNE, C. J., The root <i>mhb</i> attested in Ugaritic	312
NORTH, R., Flesh, covering and response, Ex. xxi 10.	204
RICHARDSON, H. N., Two Addenda to "Some Notes on p^{h} and its Derivatives"	434
ROSÉN, H. B., Arawna—Nom hittite?	318
SUTCLIFFE, E. F., A Gloss in Jeremiah vii 4	313
—, A Note on ' <i>al</i> , ' <i>l</i> ', and <i>from</i>	436
TALMON, S., A Case of faulty Harmonization	206
TURNER, N. The unique Character of biblical Greek	208
WALKER, N., Concerning the Function of ' <i>eth</i>	314
WINTER, P., Ben Sira and the Teaching of "Two Ways" ..	315
ZOLLI, E., ' <i>Eyn</i> ' <i>adam</i> (Zach. ix 1).....	90

Reviews:

BURROWS, M.	
J. Simons, Jerusalem in the Old Testament	93
CAZELLES, H.	
R. North, Sociology of the biblical Jubilee.....	321
The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. 2.....	324
J. Bottéro, Le Problème des Hābiru à la 4ème Rencontre assyriologique internationale	440
HONEYMAN, A. M.	
L. Koehler, W. Baumgartner, Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros	214

JOHNSON, A. R.	
H. J. Franken, The mystical communion with Jhwh in the Book of Psalms	326
SPREY, TH.	
W. Zimmerli, Erkenntnis Gottes nach dem Buche Ezechiel, eine theologische Studie	445
SZYSZMAN, S.	
L. Nemoy, Karaite Anthology	328
WINTER, P.	
A. Dupont-Sommer, The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes	105
WRIGHT, G. E.	
O. Tufnell, Lachish III	97
<i>Booklists:</i>	111, 223, 336, 447
<i>Indexes:</i>	
General	449
Authors cited	453
Biblical Quotations	459

DOCTRINES OF CAUSALITY IN HITTITE AND BIBLICAL HISTORIOGRAPHY: A PARALLEL *)

BY

A. MALAMAT
Jerusalem

The increasing number of Hittite texts has furnished some important comparative material for the study of the Bible. This is especially true of the field of historiography, which was a literary genre in the Ancient Near East, apparently introduced by the Hittites and brought to artistic perfection by the Israelites. Hittite historiography ¹⁾ was the prototype of the later Assyrian annalistic literature and possibly influenced the historical writing of the Bible as well, in spite of the latter's uniqueness. ²⁾

The present paper attempts to point out a parallel between Hittite and Biblical historiography involving similar methods, based on the doctrine of causality ³⁾, which explain national catastrophes. We shall deal first with the chronologically earlier example, taken from the Hittite sources.

*) A paper presented at the XXIIIrd International Congress of Orientalists, Cambridge, 1954.

¹⁾ For Hittite historiography in general cf. GÖTZE, *Hethiter, Churriter und Assyrier* (Oslo, 1936), pp. 73 ff., and especially GÜTERBOCK, "Die historische Tradition bei Babyloniern und Hethitern", *ZA* XLIV (1938), pp. 94 ff.

²⁾ If so, the extent of this influence and the manner in which it was transmitted remain to be studied. One possible way of absorbing features of Hittite civilization would have been the ancient population of Jerusalem, which was, according to Biblical tradition, partly Hittite. After the conquest of Jerusalem by David its prominent citizenry would certainly have been incorporated into the Israelite administration; cf. YEIVIN, "Jerusalem under the Davidic Dynasty", *VT* III (1953), pp. 149 ff.; also MAISLER, *BJPES* XIII (1947), pp. 105 ff. (Hebrew).

³⁾ For the Hittite sources, especially the annals of Murshili, this doctrine was clearly recognized by FURLANI, *Saggi sulla civiltà degli Hittiti* (Udine, 1939). It seems that Murshili, whose Plague Prayers are discussed in our paper, advanced the historiographical character of the annalistic literature more than anybody else. As to Biblical historiography, the principle of causality would appear to be one of its most basic features; cf. the remarks of CASSUTO, "The Rise of Historiography in Israel", *Eretz-Israel (Archaeol. Histor., and Geogr. Stud.)*, vol. I (Jerusalem, 1951), pp. 85 ff. (Hebrew).

Murshili, the Hittite king (c. 1340-1310), composes a prayer to the Hattian Storm-god and other Hattian gods concerning a catastrophic plague ¹⁾ which had broken out in the Hittite Empire during the reign of his father, Shuppiluliuma (c. 1375-1340), and had already lasted for twenty years. Murshili asserts his innocence in connection with the deadly disease and is eager to expose the causes of the national disaster by means of an omen, a dream, or prophecy. The king finally consults an oracle whereby he learns of the existence of two ancient tablets providing a clue for the outbreak of the epidemic. For our problem, we are interested only in the second tablet, concerning which we quote the relevant passage ²⁾: "The second tablet concerned Kurushtama. When the Hattian Storm-god had brought people of Kurushtama to the country of Egypt and had made an agreement concerning them with the Hattians so that they were under oath to the Hattian Storm-god—although the Hattians as well as the Egyptians were under oath to the Hattian Storm-god, the Hattians ignored their obligations; the Hattians promptly broke the oath of the gods. My father sent foot-soldiers and charioteers who attacked the country of Amqa, Egyptian territory. Again he sent troops and again they attacked it."

At this point Murshili tells of the Egyptians murdering one of Shuppiluliuma's sons which led to another war against Egypt whereby many prisoners were taken. The plague first broke out among these prisoners and was carried by them into Hatti.

This is the factual record of the origin of the plague. Yet to the King's mind there is a deeper reason for the misfortune. He finds it in the violation of the peace treaty made between the Hittites and the Egyptians, as follows: "Now, when I found that tablet dealing with the country of Egypt, I made the matter the subject of an oracle of the god (and asked): 'Those arrangements which were made by the Hattian Storm-god, — namely that the Egyptians and the Hattians as well were put under oath by the Hattian Storm-god, that the Dam-nashsharas deities ³⁾ were present in the temple of the Hattian Storm-

¹⁾ The Hittite word translated by "plague" is *ḫinkan*, literally, "dying", cf. FRIEDRICH, *ZA* XXXV (1924), pp. 19 f. Cf. also the Akkadian *mutānu* "pest, epidemic", literally "deaths", plural from singular *mūtu*, "death".

²⁾ The translation of the Plague Prayer followed here is that of GOETZE, *apud* PRITCHARD, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts* (Princeton, 1950) (hereafter abbreviated *ANET*), p. 395, § 4f. Cf. also the same scholar's edition of these prayers in *Kleinas. Forsch. I* (1929), pp. 209 ff.

³⁾ The exact character of these deities, apparently witnesses to the treaty,

god, and that the Hattians promptly broke their word—has this perhaps become the cause of the anger of the Hattian Storm-god, my Lord?’ And (so) it was established.” Murshili then relates how he tried to appease the gods by humbling himself and by presenting them with offerings, and how he was prepared to make restitution for his father’s sin¹).

The circumstances surrounding the treaty between Hatti and Egypt and its violation furnish important historical data. The conclusion of the treaty is connected with the somewhat obscure emigration of the people of the city of Kurushtama, located in the country of the Kashkeans, in northern Anatolia²). The reason for the departure of this people remains unknown and thus we are unable to determine whether it occurred voluntarily or as the result of compulsion. The movement of individuals, as well as of entire cities³),

remains doubtful. Cf. the suggestion of FORRER, *PEFQS*t (1937), pp. 108 ff. and GASTER, *The Oldest Stories in the World* (New York, 1952), p. 153. We only know for certain that they were female and that Hittite goddesses figure quite commonly beside gods as witnesses in treaties.

¹) In this connection it is interesting to note the statement by Murshili that “it is only true, however, that the father’s sin falls upon the son. So, my father’s sin has fallen upon me” (cf. *ANET*, *op.cit.*, § 9). This doctrine is in accord with the Biblical idea expressed in the third of the Ten Commandments (Ex. xx 5; Deut. v 9) and in the popular proverb “The fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children’s teeth are set on edge” (Ez. xviii 2). See also the tragic fate of the sons of King Saul who suffered death for their father’s crime, discussed *infra* p. 8. The prophets, however, emphasizing individual responsibility, sharply opposed this principle (Ez. *ib*; Mi. vi 7 and cf. also Deut. xxiv 16).

Dr W. F. GEERS (Oriental Institute, Chicago) informs me that in a Babylonian prayer the god Marduk is entreated to remove not only the sin of the suppliant himself but, also, that of his ancestors, from his father’s side as well as his mother’s (Cf. KING, *Babylonian Magic and Sorcery* [London, 1896], No. 11 : 22 ff.).

²) For the geographical location of Kurushtama see the Great Speech of Hattushili III, col. ii : 8, 54, and a parallel text *KBo* VI 29 i : 28 (cf. GÖTZE, “Hattušiliš”, *MVAG* XXIX [1924], pp. 14, 20, 46)

³) An express reference to a city or district is made in the famous treaty between Ramses II and Hattushili III, Hittite version, rev. ll. 10 ff. (cf. GÖTZE, *ANET*, p. 203); Egyptian version, ll. 23 ff. (WILSON, *ib.* p. 200); in the treaty between Murshili II and Duppi-Teshup, col. iii: 12ff. (cf. FRIEDRICH, “Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches”, *MVAG* XXXI [1926], p. 20), and in the treaty between Shuppiluliuma and Shunashshura, col. i: 14 ff. (cf. WEIDNER, *Boghazköi-Studien* [Leipzig, 1923], p. 90, who erroneously took the Hittite king to be Muwatalli, but see BILABEL, *Gesch. Vorderasiens*, etc. [Heidelberg, (1926)], pp. 294 ff. and MEYER, *Geschichte* II/1² [Stuttgart & Berlin, (1928)], p. 372 n. 2). For an earlier allusion to the movement of an entire settlement, probably from the second half of the fifteenth century, cf. the treaty of a Hittite king and the country of Kizzuwatna published recently by G. MEYER, “Zwei neue Kizzuwatna Verträge”, *Mitt. Instit. Orientfor.* I (1953), pp. 108 ff.

must have been a well known phenomenon in the 14th and 13th century, as demonstrated by some treaties which have been recovered, although in these treaties only fugitives, political or otherwise, are referred to. In general the policy of the Hittites with regard to such refugees, as evidenced by the treaties, was to insist on their extradition to Hatti ¹⁾. In contrast to that in our case it is not stated that the people of Kurushtama must return to Hatti. Indeed the very agreement with Egypt came into existence on behalf of the Kurushtameans and as a result of their settlement in Egyptian territory, by which is meant, most probably, the Egyptian dependencies in Asia ²⁾. That the move of the Kurushtameans took place with the full consent of the Hittites is also suggested by the part ascribed to the Hattian Storm-god.

New light is shed on this, as well as on other points, by a fragment of a new version of the annals of Shuppiluliuma, compiled by Murshili, dealing with the request of an Egyptian queen, the widow of Tutankhamon, to marry one of the sons of the Hittite king. The text of the annals known hitherto already exhibited certain links with the Plague Prayer, describing as it did how an attack on Amqa apparently led to the famous bid of the Egyptian queen, and how this request was granted, one of Shuppiluliuma's sons being sent to Egypt ³⁾. The further course of events, as we have already seen, is recorded in the Plague Prayer, which relates the murder of the son by the Egyptians, and the consequences it brought about ⁴⁾.

¹⁾ In the case of a so-called *Paritätsvertrag*, i.e. treaty between equal partners, such as the one discussed in our paper, the one between Ramses II and Hattushili III, and the one with Kizzuwatna published by MEYER (cf. foregoing note), extradition was reciprocal. In treaties made with subordinate partners, however, the agreement was unilateral, i.e., only the vassal was obligated to return refugees, whereas the Hittites had to extradite solely peasants and craftsmen but not regular fugitives. For the time of Shuppiluliuma cf. that king's treaty with Mattiwaza, king of Mitanni, rev. ll. 9ff. (cf. WEIDNER, *op.cit.* p. 22). For other similar treaties cf. KOROŠEC, *Hettitische Staatsverträge* (Leipzig, 1931), pp. 80 f.

²⁾ I.e. Palestine and Southern Syria. This fact led FORRER to his theory regarding the origin of the Hittites in the hill country of Palestine, cf. his study "The Hittites in Palestine", *PEQSt* (1936), pp. 190 ff.; (1937), pp. 100 ff., and also GURNEY, *The Hittites* (Penguin ed., 1952), pp. 60 ff.

³⁾ *KBo V 6 iii*: 1ff. Cf. the recent translation by GOETZE, *ANET*, p. 319.

⁴⁾ Other documents probably deal with the same events. FORRER, *Forschungen*, II, pp. 28ff., published a badly damaged copy of a letter sent by Shuppiluliuma to a Egyptian king (now *KUB XIX 20*), holding the latter responsible for the murder of the Hittite king's son and declaring war on Egypt as a result of it.

The name of the murdered son himself is possibly revealed as Zannanza in the fragment *KUB XIX 4* (cf. GÜTERBOCK, *Zeit. Indog. For.* LX [1950], pp. 208 ff.)

Turning now to the new version, published by GÜTERBOCK ¹⁾, we find that it includes an important additional passage about a tablet which, in view of its contents, is without any doubt the one referred to by Murshili in his Plague Prayer. Shuppiluliuma, who was encamped before Carchemish, had a certain tablet brought before him at his special request in order to emphasize the traditional friendship between Hatti and Egypt. This was on the occasion of the king's acceding to the Egyptian queen's request. The tablet, which was read before the Egyptian delegation ²⁾, designated the people of Kurush-tama as "sons of Hatti", *i.e.* Hittite subjects, and added explicitly that they had become Egyptians.

Another problem is the dating of the treaty, as no specific time is recorded in connection with it. The explicit reference to Shuppiluliuma concerns only the violation of the agreement. Its instigation, however, must similarly be attributed to this king, since a Hittite-Egyptian pact before his period seems highly improbable. Furthermore, the famous later treaty between Hattushili III and Ramses II specifically mentions an earlier compact between the two countries from the time of Shuppiluliuma ³⁾, which most probably represents our treaty. Nevertheless we cannot accept FORRER's assumption that the treaty dates from a rather late period in Shuppiluliuma's reign, just before the siege of Carchemish or even contemporary with it ⁴⁾. For the tablet which recorded a Hittite-Egyptian peace treaty already enjoyed a certain antiquity when brought to Carchemish, as is shown by the new version of Shuppiluliuma's annals. It is true such a peace treaty certainly could have been concluded only subsequent to a contact between Hittites and Kashkeans, because this document is connected with the emigration of the Kurush-ta-means, who originated in the country of the Kashkeans. FORRER accordingly links this treaty with the conquest of the Kashkeans a

¹⁾ "Neue Texte zur Geschichte Šuppiluliumas", *ib.*, pp. 199 ff. I am obliged to Prof. H. G. GÜTERBOCK, Chicago, for discussing with me various problems concerning the Hittite sources.

²⁾ The repeated public recital of previously concluded treaties was a common practice. One of its main purposes was undoubtedly to remind parties of the various obligations binding them. Cf. KOROŠEC, *op.cit.*, pp. 101 f.

Note also the Biblical injunction to read "the words of the book of the covenant" to the people which was carried out, for instance, by King Josiah in his new covenant with God (2 Kings xxiii 1 ff.).

³⁾ The name of the Hittite king is expressly mentioned only in the Egyptian version of the treaty, l. 14.

⁴⁾ Cf. PEQS_t (1937), pp. 111 f.

year or so before the siege of Carchemish ¹⁾. There was, however, another war with the Kashkeans at the beginning of Shuppiluliuma's reign, or, more precisely, when the king still served as a commander under his father. It seems likely therefore that the peace treaty was associated with this earlier war ²⁾.

So early a date for a treaty of peace between Hittites and Egyptians is favored also by the evidence of a letter from Shuppiluliuma to Amenophis IV (EA 41) demonstrating their friendship and pointing to the friendly relations which existed between that Hittite king and Pharaoh's father. It may be, therefore, that the Hittite-Egyptian treaty under discussion represents an alliance between Shuppiluliuma and Amenophis III (c. 1398-1361). ³⁾ Even if it represents a pact between Shuppiluliuma and Amenophis IV (c. 1369-1353), it must have been concluded many years before the siege of Carchemish, since there is no longer any doubt that this latter event synchronizes roughly with the death of Tutankhamon (c. 1344) ⁴⁾.

Another argument in favor of the same conclusion can be drawn from letter No. 170 of the El Amarna archive. This much debated letter already bears witness to an ignoring on the part of the Hittites of the peace agreement between them and Egypt, as it mentions a Hittite raid on Amqa, the disputed border zone between the two powers ⁵⁾. Now this raid on Amqa cannot be identical with the one

¹⁾ Cf. *ib.*, pp. 110 f. The relevant documents are *KBo* V 6 and the previously mentioned letter of Shuppiluliuma to an Egyptian king, *KUB* XIX 20 (*supra* p. 4 n. 4).

²⁾ For this war cf. 2 *BoTU* 33 ii : 12; 34 i : 6 (*KUB* XIX 11) and CAVAIGNAC; *Subbiluliuma et son temps* (Paris, 1932), pp. 15 f. In this connection it may be worth recalling the demand of Pharaoh Amenophis III that the king of Arzawa dispatch Kashkean people to him (EA 31 : 25; cf. the new translation by CAVAIGNAC, *Le problème hittite* [Paris, 1936], p. 28; also FORRER, *Forschungen*, II, pp. 21 f.). If this is actually a reference to the matter of the Kurushtameans, their resettlement must be dated in a rather early period.

³⁾ In the matter of Egyptian chronology we follow WILSON's most recent attempt, although this, in his own words, remains rather tentative; cf. *JNES* XIII (1954), p. 128.

⁴⁾ The name of the deceased husband of the Egyptian queen sending ambassadors to Carchemish is rendered in the new version of Shuppiluliuma's annals as Niphururiya (a preferable form to the name Piphururiya, known hitherto, cf. *KBo* V 6 iii : 7). This is one of the throne names of Tutankhamon, not of Amenophis IV, and the identification with the former is now accordingly definite, cf. EDEL, *JNES* VII (1948), pp. 14f.

⁵⁾ For the precise location of this region in the Liṭāni Valley, *i.e.* the southern part of the so-called Biq'ah, cf. now AHARONI, *Israel Explor. Jour.* III (1953), pp. 153 ff.

begun just prior to and continuing during the time of the siege of Carchemish by Shuppiluliuma, a nearly axiomatic identification accepted by scholars ¹⁾. For besides certain discrepancies inherent in the sources dealing with the two attacks, the Amarna letter must go back to the time of Amenophis IV, the city of El Amarna having been deserted soon after that Pharaoh died. The other attack, however, as stated before, occurred about the time of Tutankhamon's death which is at least ten years later ²⁾. In my opinion, therefore, EA 170 and other letters from the archive of El Amarna dealing with a Hittite attack on Amqa (EA 140, 174, 175, 176, AO 7097 ³⁾) coincide with the first raid on Amqa mentioned in the Plague Prayer, which constituted the original violation of the Hittite-Egyptian peace treaty. The second campaign to the same region recorded in the Plague Prayer ("again he sent troops and again they attacked it") could easily be identical with the later attack on Amqa which occurred just before the siege of Carchemish.

To sum up, we shall try to provide a tentative chronological arrangement of Hittite-Egyptian relations in the time of Shuppiluliuma as illustrated respectively by the conclusion and each successive violation of the treaty between them:

1) emigration of the Kurushtameans and Hittite-Egyptian alliance — earlier period of Shuppiluliuma, after first war against the Kashkeans.

2) original violation of treaty: 1st campaign to Amqa — time of Amenophis IV, identical with campaign of EA 170 and other EA letters cited above.

3) 2nd campaign to Amqa — time of siege of Carchemish and death of Tutankhamon.

4) final attack on Egyptian territory in Asia-period after murder of Shuppiluliuma's son, time of Pharaoh Eye, pestilence carried into Hatti.

We cannot here enter into a discussion of how the foregoing arrangement affects the more general question of Shuppiluliuma's campaigns to Syria. This problem should be dealt with only after a renewed

¹⁾ Cf. most recently SMITH, "Amarna Letter 170 and Chronology", *Halil Edhem Volume*, I (1947), pp. 33 ff., and references to earlier studies there.

²⁾ Cf. the excellent analysis by STURM, "Wer ist Piphururiaš?", *RHA* II (No. 13 [1933]), pp. 161 ff.

³⁾ Cf. THUREAU-DANGIN, *RA* XIX (1922), pp. 94 f.

investigation of all the material about this Hittite king, available today, together with the EA correspondence ¹).

Having examined the events which, according to Hittite historiography, resulted in the national misfortune, we may turn to the Bible, which yields a surprisingly similar picture in connection with the outbreak of the famine in the days of King David (c. 1005-965): "Now there was a famine in the days of David for three years, year after year: and David sought the face of the Lord. And the Lord said, 'There is blood guilt on Saul and on his house, because he put the Gibeonites to death.' So the king called the Gibeonites and said to them — Now the Gibeonites were not of the people of Israel, but of the remnant of the Amorites; although the people of Israel, had sworn to spare them, Saul had sought to slay them in his zeal for the people of Israel and Judah. — And David said to the Gibeonites: 'What shall I do for you? And how shall I make expiation, that you may bless the heritage of the Lord?' " (2 Sam. xxi 1-3). The Gibeonites asked David, from vengeful motives and, apparently, also for some symbolic reasons, to deliver to them seven sons of Saul (c. 1020-1005) in order that they might kill them ²). The king was eager to fulfill their request. The narrative goes on to describe the exposure of Saul's descendants and their subsequent burial, together with the bones of Saul himself and Jonathan, and concludes: "After that God heeded supplications for the land" (*ib.* vs. 14).

Even at first glance the parallel features with the Plague Prayer are striking. Similar external circumstances gave rise to corresponding interpretations: in both sources the national disaster is understood to be the consequence of the violation of a treaty. It did not matter whether the catastrophe consisted of a plague as among the Hittites, or of a famine as inflicted upon the Israelites. Both calamities

¹) Cf. tentatively GÖTZE, "Šuppiluliumas syrische Feldzüge", *Klio* XIX (1925), pp. 347 ff. GOETZE adduces evidence for some five separate campaigns of the Hittite King in Syria; cf. also CAVAIGNAC, *Subbiluliuma et son temps, passim*. New light on this problem, as well as on Hittite relations with Egypt, will undoubtedly be shed by the new tablets from Ugarit — among them a letter from Šuppiluliuma — recently unearthed at Ras-Shamra, and as yet unpublished; cf. *The Manchester Guardian*, February 11, 1954.

²) The blood-thirsty demand of the Gibeonites is in accord with the retribution clauses in the Hittite treaties, which state explicitly that in case of neglect of the treaty provisions the whole family is liable. For examples cf. the references in KOROŠEC, *op.cit.*, pp. 102 ff.

were considered corresponding punishments for a national offense ¹). David, like Murshili, asked the oracle for an explanation of the famine ²), and in both cases the answer is that not the living king himself but his predecessor is responsible. Yet Saul's guilt cannot consist merely in the slaying of the Gibeonites, as he had killed other people as well. The actual sin is, in my opinion, explained clearly enough by the statement that the Gibeonites had been slain "although the people of Israel had sworn to spare them". 2 Sam. xxi 2, therefore, is in keeping with the historiographical doctrine, stated more explicitly in the Hittite sources, and need not be a later gloss as maintained by the commentators ³).

Fortunately for our purpose, the events surrounding the conclusion of the treaty with the Gibeonites are recorded elsewhere in the Bible. The episode is narrated in the Book of Joshua (chap. ix 3 ff.) according to which the Gibeonites, alarmed by the decisive victories of the conquering Israelites, secured an alliance with them rather than meet them on the battlefield. This alliance was established by means of a trick, the Gibeonite emissaries succeeding in obtaining a peace treaty from Joshua by pretending to have come from a faraway country, outside the Israelite sphere of interest. The people of Israel discovered the deception and became enraged with their leaders for concluding the treaty, but, once executed, it could not be repudiated: ⁴) "We have sworn to them by the Lord, the God of Israel,

¹) For the threat of a famine in the Hittite sources for ignoring an oath cf. The Soldiers Oath, col. ii: 31ff.; iii: 39ff.; iv: 5ff. (GOETZE, *ANET*, pp. 353 ff.). On the other hand a plague as well as a famine are listed among the sore judgments of God in the Bible (Ez. xiv 21; 1 Kings viii 37ff.) and are offered as alternatives to David for expiating his sin of compiling a census (2 Sam. xxiv 13).

Such punishments were not only typical of Hittite or Biblical treaties (cf. the curses and the covenant with God in Deut., chaps. xxviii f.) but seem to have had a universal prevalence in the Ancient Near East. For the Assyrians see especially the treaty between Shamshi-Adad V and Marduk-zākir-shumi I, l. 19 (WEIDNER, *Afo VIII* [1932], pp. 27ff.) and for the Aramean states in Syria cf. BAUER, "Ein aramäischer Staatsvertrag aus dem 8. Jahrhundert", *ib.*, pp. 1 ff.

²) The Biblical text has "sought the face of the Lord", clearly referring to an oracle (see Vulgate), the exact nature of which, however, remains uncertain. The later Talmudic literature interprets the expression as an appeal to the obscure Urim and Tummim, cf. *Babyl. Tal.*, *Jeb.*, 78b f.; *Bam. rabbah*, chap. 8.

³) Cf. H. P. SMITH, *The Books of Samuel* (New York, 1899), p. 374; NOWACK, *Bücher Samuelis* (Göttingen, 1902), pp. 237 f.; CAIRD, *Interpreters Bible*, vol. II (New York, 1953), p. 1158; and others. For the genuineness of this passage cf. KRONER, "Die Misshandlung der Volksfremden eine Entweihung Gottes", *Festschrift A. Schwarz* (Berlin & Wien, 1917), p. 68 n. 2.

⁴) Cf. KRAETSCHMAR, *Die Bundesvorstellung im Alten Testament* (Marburg, 1896), pp. 10f., 28, *et passim*; BEGRICH, "Berit", *etc.*, *ZAW LX* (1944), p. 3.

and now we may not touch them. This we will do to them and let them live, lest wrath be upon us, because of the oath which we swore to them" (Josh. ix 19-21). The Gibeonites were, however, condemned to the *corvées*, in accordance with Biblical law, and the tradition has it that they became "hewers of wood and drawers of water to all the congregation" ¹⁾).

The ethnic origin of the Gibeonites remains obscure. In the passage in Samuel discussed above they are presented under the name of Amorites, which of course has there the mere meaning of the autochthonous population of Palestine. In the Book of Joshua, however, the Gibeonites are designated as Hivites (chap. ix 7; cf. also xi 19), a term which may refer to a non Semitic element and possibly to Hittites or Hurrians, as the reading of the Septuagint gives it ²⁾. In any case, in the Book of Joshua (ix 17) the term Gibeonites is a collective name referring to a confederacy of four cities: Gibeon, Chephirah, Beeroth and Kiriath-Jearim, named after the most important of these places ³⁾.

Mindful of this fact, we may try to clarify the historical circumstances which led to the violation of the treaty with the Gibeonites by Saul. Indeed, we have no direct information in the Bible concerning any annihilation of the Gibeonites by Saul. However, it seems rather likely that this occurred, since the Gibeonite confederacy, consisting of a chain of foreign "pockets" on the Western border of the territory of Benjamin, constituted an obvious security risk, especially during Saul's wars with the Philistines. Gibeon proper occupied an important strategic position (cf. also Josh. x 2), controlling the roads to the Western lowland and in the South the

¹⁾ Cf. Deut. xx 10-18, where for the conduct of the holy war an express distinction is made between a distant enemy and a hostile city in the midst of the Israelite territory. Only the former was privileged to enter a peace treaty which, however, subjected the foreign population to menial service.

Many scholars believe the enslavement of the Gibeonites to reflect the situation of a later period when they supposedly served in the temple of King Solomon. The authenticity of all the details of Josh., chap. ix, is, however, irrelevant for an analysis of the historiographical method of the Bible, as undertaken here; cf. also BALSCHERT, *Gottesbund und Staat* (Zürich, 1940), pp. 38 f.

²⁾ In our place (Josh. ix 13 in the Greek version) and in Gen. xxxiv 2 the Septuagint has χορραῖος, whereas in Josh. xi 3 Hittites and Hivites are translated interchangeably by Cod. Vat.; cf. SPEISER, *AASOR* XIII (1933), pp. 29f. and PATERSON, *Present. Vol. to W.B. Stevenson* (Glasgow, 1945), pp. 100 ff.

³⁾ For the precise location of the four cities and their modern identifications cf. ABEL, *Géographie de la Palestine*, II (Paris, 1938), *ad. loc.*

road to Jerusalem. This is clearly shown by the immediate action taken against Gibeon by a coalition of Canaanite principalities, headed by the king of Jerusalem, in response to the peace treaty with Joshua. Furthermore, Joshua's subsequent victory over the Canaanites at Gibeon had far reaching military results, rendering helpless before his troops the whole Western border of the Judaeon mountain slopes ¹).

Indeed, we have some indirect evidence that such a policy was pursued by Saul with respect to the Hivite cities. In connection with the murder of Ishbaal (Ishbosheth), Saul's son and successor, by two army officers who were from Beeroth, the historian notes that "Beeroth also is reckoned to Benjamin" and that "the Beerothites fled to Gittaim and have been sojourners there to this day" (2 Sam. iv 2-3). These remarks indicate that the aforementioned city was incorporated into the Israelite tribal system, whereby, in all probability, its former inhabitants had to take refuge elsewhere. Obviously these events took place in the time of Saul and could easily be understood as the result of that king's action against Beeroth ²). The express accusation by the surviving Gibeonites in their discussion with David that Saul "planned to destroy us so that we should have no place in all the territory of Israel" (*ib.* xxi 5) seems to support our inference.

The animosity between Saul and the Hivite confederacy may be illustrated by a further incident. One of David's most important military adherents, joining him on his escape from Saul, was a Gibeonite. This person, Ishmaiah of Gibeon, "a mighty man among the thirty (גִּבּוֹר בְּשָׁלֹשִׁים) and a leader of the thirty" *i.e.* a former commander of David's military band, joined the future king, who "could not move about freely because of Saul the son of Kish", at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii 1-4).

The Bible sees Saul's conduct toward the Gibeonites as originating not from personal hatred but from political motives for the benefit of his people ("in his zeal for the people of Israel and Judah").

¹ Cf. MALAMAT, *The Conquest of Palestine in the Time of Joshua*² (Jerusalem, 1954), p. 26 (Hebrew).

² Cf. KITTEL, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, II ⁶, ⁷ (Gotha, 1925), p. 131; MAISLER, *Toledoth Eretz-Israel* (Tel-Aviv, 1938), p. 267; and especially AUERBACH, *Wüste und gelobtes Land*, I² (Berlin, 1938), pp. 179ff. The last scholar argues among other things that Kiriath-Jearim was likewise incorporated into the Israelite tribes by Saul, but his evidence is insufficient; cf. KAUFMANN, *Toledoth ha'emunah bay-Yisre'elith*, 1/3 (Tel-Aviv, 1938), p. 647.

However, according to the Biblical historiography, this was no excuse for ignoring the terms of a treaty once concluded, as in the case of the Hittites, where Shuppiluliuma's campaign against Egypt was undoubtedly in itself a patriotic step. It does not seem to have mattered how much time elapsed between the conclusion of a treaty and its violation; nor that the effect of the sin may have occurred a considerable time later, even after the death of the king who violated the treaty. In any case the transgression was not absolved with the death of the guilty king. In both sources, the Hittite and the Biblical, the guilt was laid to a king, who, as the representative of the entire people, seems to have been held responsible for a disaster of national proportions ¹).

But the most notable parallel between the two sources lies in the phenomenological structure of cause and effect, as revealed in the sequence: conclusion of treaty, violation of treaty and consequent national catastrophe ²).

¹) Cf. PEDERSEN, *Israel, its Life and Culture*, III-IV (London & Copenhagen, 1940), pp. 81 f.

²) Our case seems not to be an isolated phenomenon as there is at least one other Hittite-Biblical parallel touching upon the period of David, and likewise concerning the violation of an oath. In this instance the oath was sworn by the army to its king. Cf. Y. SUKENIK [Yadin], "The Lame and the Blind" and the conquest of Jerusalem by David, *World Congress of Jew. Studies*, I (Jerusalem, 1952), pp. 222ff. (Hebrew); cf. also *supra* p. 1 n. 2.

“PSALM CRITICISM BETWEEN 1900 AND 1935”

(UGARIT AND PSALM EXEGESIS)

BY

SIGMUND MOWINCKEL

Oslo

1. In his paper “The Psalm of Habakkuk” in the *Robinson Jubilee Volume*¹⁾ W. F. ALBRIGHT says on p. 7, n. 24: “it will be evident that Psalm criticism now (i.e. after the Ugarit finds) stands on the threshold of a new day, in sharp contrast to the situation between 1900 and 1935”. He has expressed the same opinion in somewhat fuller form elsewhere²⁾.

In another place³⁾ he speaks of the “pre-Ugaritic” period of Psalm exegesis and declares “the sanest study” of Ps. lxxviii from that period to be M. BUTTENWIESER’s treatment of this psalm⁴⁾.

It is against the background of this feeling of having inaugurated a new era that we must understand Prof. ALBRIGHT’s verdict in his note on the present writer’s book⁵⁾ on the Psalms, in *BASOR* 126 (April 1952), p. 34: “The author is very pessimistic about the reviewer’s insistence on the fundamental importance of Ugaritic literature for all future study of the Psalter (e.g. p. 601 f.)”. By the way, I cannot agree that my refutation of some of ALBRIGHT’s arguments for Davidic authorship (pp. 601 f.) is rightly characterized as “pessimistic about the importance of Ugaritic literature” for future Psalm study, especially when read in the light of what I have said in my book on that theme (e.g. pp. 448 ff.). In this respect, however, I cannot attribute to the Ugarit texts “fundamental importance” in

¹⁾ *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*, Presented to Professor Theodore H. Robinson . . . : Ed. by H. H. ROWLEY, Edinburgh 1950.

²⁾ W. F. ALBRIGHT, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, Baltimore 1942, p. 126. Cf. also his *Archaeology of Palestine*, Pelican Books 1949, pp. 226, 230 f.

³⁾ *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, p. 211, n. 103.

⁴⁾ M. BUTTENWIESER, *The Psalms, Chronologically Treated with a New Translation*, Chicago 1938, pp. 29 ff.

⁵⁾ S. MOWINCKEL, *Offersang og sangoffer. Salmediktningen i Bibelen*, Oslo 1951.

the sense of the first quotation from ALBRIGHT, and that is just what I shall try to prove in the present paper.

That is also the reason why I have quoted ALBRIGHT's verdict on BUTTENWIESER's treatment of Ps. lxviii. BUTTENWIESER's commentary represents the extreme consequences of the *zeitgeschichtliche* interpretation of the Psalms with its mania for fixing the date of every single Psalm and its superstitious belief in the possibility of this method, a mode of interpretation that has learnt nothing from the form- and type-critical and cult-functional points of view, which have been elaborated in the very period between 1900 and 1935. BUTTENWIESER's commentary is in no way typical of the methods, viewpoints and results of Psalm research, at least not in Europe. Methodologically it belongs in fact to the period before 1900. ALBRIGHT does not seem to have fully appreciated the actual state of Psalm research in "pre-Ugaritic" times. If he had, he could not have talked about "a new day" and the "sharp contrast" to the situation between 1900 and 1935.

The importance of the Ugarit texts is, generally and preliminarily speaking, that they give us the historical and literary Canaanite background of Israelite religious poetry. ALBRIGHT has given a good sketch of this background and its general influence on Israelite sacred poetry in his *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, pp. 14-16. The Ugaritic texts have given us samples of religious poetry in "the language of Canaan", from a time before the Israelite immigration, representing a culture adopted by the Israelites, and a religion from which, to say the least, they took over many religious forms and conceptions, positively as well as negatively (by "contrast influence"). We must now ask, in what definite respects? and, what can these texts teach us about the Psalms?

Here we have to remember that real Psalms are scantily, if at all, represented among the Ugarit texts. The most evident samples are two fragments in the Accadian language ¹⁾, the first one with the typical hymnic introduction, "I will sing to the Lady, the goddess of"; the second one beginning "O Majesty, Lady of the source" seems to be an invocation for help in some distress (a "psalm of lamentation"), as the Lady is being addressed as "Lady of magic, witchcraft and incantations". More uncertain is the text in

¹⁾ The text RS 94 and RS 95; cf. R. DE LANGHE, *Les Textes de Ras Shamra-Ugarit et leurs Rapports avec le Milieu Biblique de l'Ancien Testament* I-II, Gembloux-Paris 1945, I, pp. 211 f.

the Ugaritic language ¹⁾, which seems to include an invocation of the god El or the goddess 'Anat. The material for a direct comparison between Israelite and Ugaritic hymnology is therefore very scanty. But at least we know that a Ugaritic hymnology did exist; and we have some few lines from it. We shall see later on that even the other Ugaritic texts can give much help towards a better understanding of very many things in the Psalms.

First, however, we must make up our minds as to the questions we would like to put to the Ugaritic texts, and on what basis of historical research we are putting them.

2. On the whole two things characterize the new orientation within Psalm interpretation, which has taken place "between 1900 and 1935" as distinguished from the earlier Psalm criticism, which for convenience may be said to have started with Heinrich EWALD and culminated in Bernhard DUHM, and which in America has produced two late products: PFEIFFER's conception of the Psalms and their problems in his *Introduction* ²⁾ and BUTTENWIESER's commentary.

One is the form-critical method, or the study of literary types, with its logical continuation in the cult-historical or cult-functional conception of the Psalms. It is associated, above all, with the name of Hermann GUNKEL ³⁾.

Form-criticism, "die Form- und Gattungsforschung", is the absolutely indispensable basis of any understanding of the Psalms. It has taught us to distinguish between a certain number of types ("Gattungen"), easily definable with regard to form and content, in which each individual example has been composed according to the very fixed, established rules of form and content, and has shown that each of these types has sprung up out of a definite "Sitz im Leben", out of its traditionally fixed function in religious life, a situation and a function, which have created the very elements of form and content, which are peculiar to the type in question. All features belonging to an individual type, point clearly to cultic

¹⁾ The text RS 13 + 43; cf. DE LANGHE, *op. cit.* I, pp. 173 f.

²⁾ R. PFEIFFER, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, New York-Londen 1941, pp. 619 ff.

³⁾ H. GUNKEL, "Die israelitische Literaturgeschichte", in *Kultur der Gegenwart*, herausgeg. v. P. HINNEBERG, I 7, *Die Orientalischen Literaturen*, Berlin-Leipzig 1906; "Die Königspsalmen" in *Preuss. Jahrbücher* 158, 1914, pp. 42 ff.; "Psalmen" in *RGG* and *RGG*²; *Ausgewählte Psalmen*, Göttingen 1903, 4. Aufl. 1917; *Die Psalmen* (Göttinger Handkommentar z. A. T. II 2), 1926; GUNKEL und J. BEGRICH, *Einleitung in die Psalmen*, Göttingen 1933.

situations and functions as the spring-heads of the "species"¹). On the basis of criteria, which are capable of being objectively demonstrated, such as style and form in their union with definite elements of content, each having its place in the situation and function in question, we are able to decide the species and context of an individual Psalm, just as in botany we are able to decide the species of the individual plant and its place within the system on the basis of such objective criteria as the form and number of stamens, petals and sepals, and the placing of these organs above or below the ovary etc. etc.

The consequence of this viewpoint (as compared with what we know about the use of Psalms, partly from notes and suggestions in the headings, partly from other sources and from parallels in other religions inside as well as outside the Oriental circle of cultures) is that the connection with the cultus does not only apply to the species and their origin, to psalmography as such, but also to the great majority of individual Psalms handed down to us²).

The great majority of them are real cultic Psalms, composed for and used in the various situations within the public temple service of Israel, mainly in Jerusalem. Only against the back-ground of these fixed traditional rules of style shall we be quite able to understand and estimate the individual, personal, new features of any particular Psalm.

The fact that the Psalms were composed for use in the regularly or occasionally recurring cultic situations, for the cultic needs of the congregation or for recitation by or on behalf of any member of the congregation (who might be in such a position that he would have to submit to certain cult-ritual treatments including the recitation of a Psalm, for instance a sacrificial Psalm of lamentation and purification or a thank-offering Psalm) therefore helps to explain why the Psalms nearly always express themselves in general, often stereotyped, phrases and metaphors, in describing the particular conditions of the worshipper, for instance the nature of the disaster, the illness, or the distress, which made him resort to the temple with

¹) The summing up of this conception is to be found in GUNKEL-BEGRICH'S *Einleitung in die Psalmen*.

²) It is this consequence of form- and type-criticism (that is to say the extension of the method into a really cult-historical method) that the present writer has sought to draw and justify in his *Psalmstudien I-VI* (*Skrifter utgitt av det Norske Videnskapsakademi II Kl.*) Kristiania (Oslo) 1921-1924. The result has been summed up and partly modified in his *Offersang og sangoffer*, Oslo 1951.

sin-offering or thanksgiving Psalm. Such a Psalm was meant to be used by "Everyman" throughout all generations and would therefore have to be put in such general terms as would suit "Everyman". In principle this fact knocks the ground from under the feet of the "time-historical" interpretation used in earlier Psalm criticism, always on the look-out for allusions to events in the history of Israel or in high policy, and wishfully hoping to find the precise date of the composition of an individual Psalm, preferably also a specific person as its author.

This cult-functional interpretation of the Psalms also provides us with a much more vivid picture of the religious festivals of the old Israel than the ritual laws were able to give. Above all, it has opened the door to the complex of religious conceptions and experiences, connected with the great annual and New Year festival (the feast of Tabernacles), and centred in the conception of, and the cultic representation of, Yahweh's renewed appearance as king after having again conquered the powers of chaos, recreated the world, made sure of rain and fertility and "peace", having in principle conquered the actual and potential enemies of Israel, repeated His covenant with His people and so on,—in short, the complex of ideas about the enthronement of Yahweh, the "enthronement Psalms" being the most evident examples of these cultic realities. In connexion with this functional interpretation of the Psalms the present writer may perhaps refer to his own investigations in his *Psalmestudien*.

This interpretation has also shown us (what GUNKEL was already aware of) the central part played in the public, national cultus by the king as the representative of his people, as the intermediary between Yahweh and the people, and as the channel through which the blessings of the deity in the cultus would flow out to the congregation, and as the chief leader in the public cultus. Therefore, as a matter of course, in a great many Psalms the king, the real historical king of Israel-Judah, would appear and speak on behalf of the people or congregation. The suggestions in this direction occasionally made by GUNKEL and the present writer have been methodically developed by BIRKELAND, who has proved that even in a great many Psalms, which do not mention the king *expressis verbis*, or in which the worshipper does not introduce himself as king, the speaking Ego (I) is actually the king of the people ¹).

¹) H. BIRKELAND, *Die Feinde des Individuums in der israelitischen Psalmeliteratur*, Oslo 1933. Cf. the writer's *Offersang og sangoffer*, pp. 50-91.

The number of "king Psalms" is much greater than it appears to be at first glance. In *Ps. St.* the present writer had already interpreted the *l'dāwīd* of the headings as "destined for the (cultic) use of David", i.e. the reigning king—an interpretation which the *davidum* of the Mari-text affirms in a most welcome manner.

These developments invalidated the tendency of the earlier Psalm criticism to date the great majority of Psalms, if not all of them, in the post-exilic age. The classical age of psalmography is the period of the monarchy. Even what ALBRIGHT calls "the current critical dating of many Psalms in the Maccabean period"¹⁾ has long ago been definitively given up by the adherents of the type- and cult-historical method, a fact to which both GUNKEL's Psalm commentary²⁾, GUNKEL-BEGRICH's *Einleitung*³⁾, BENTZEN's Psalm commentary and introduction⁴⁾, and the present writer's *Ps. St.*⁵⁾ testify. Before this, BAETHGEN refuted the Maccabean dating for canon-historical reasons⁶⁾.

Therefore it cannot be denied that ALBRIGHT's picture of the situation in Psalm criticism "between 1900 and 1935" is out of perspective and quite one-sided, making WELLHAUSEN and DUHM the typical representatives of the period in question. Of course, this did not preclude at least the theoretical *possibility* of Psalms from the age of David, or at any rate of Solomon. Whether this possibility may also turn out to be a fact must be proved in the case of each individual Psalm on internal grounds. As far as Ps. cx is concerned, the present writer suggested such a possibility more than 40 years ago, in *Ps. St.* including even the possibility of Davidic-Salomonic dating for Ps. lx, of pre-Davidic dating for Ps. lxxviii; and he here takes the liberty to quote himself: "Alles spricht dafür, dass Israel religiöse Kultlieder noch vor Dawids Zeit gehabt hat; vom Stil des religiösen Hymnus ist schon das sog. Deboralied beeinflusst." (*Ps. St.* VI, p. 75).

¹⁾ In *H.U.C.A.* xxiii, 1950/51, p. 4.

²⁾ Cp. GUNKEL, *Die Psalmen*, on Pss. xlv, lxxiv, lxxix, lxxxiii (which by C. H. CORNILL, *Einleitung in die kanonischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*⁶, Tübingen 1913, p. 237, are considered the sure ground of the Maccabean hypothesis). Personally I also consider GUNKEL's dating of these 4 Psalms to be too late.

³⁾ GUNKEL-BEGRICH, *Einleitung*, pp. 437 ff.

⁴⁾ AAGE BENTZEN, *Fortolkning til de gammeltestamentlige salmer*, København 1939, on Pss. xlv, lxxiv, lxxix, lxxxiii; the same author, *Indledning til de gammeltestamentlige salmer*, København 1932, pp. 35 ff.

⁵⁾ *Ps. St.* I, p. 117; II, pp. 193 ff.; cp. pp. 190 ff.

⁶⁾ FR. BAETHGEN, *Die Psalmen*³ (Göttinger Handkommentar II 2) 1904, pp. XIII ff.

Face to face with this possibility, we may also take it for granted that the institution of temple singers must be as old as the temple itself, and that the dating of the origin of the guild of temple singers to post-exilic times on the part of the earlier criticism could not be correct. This was urged both by GUNKEL and by the present writer in *Ps. St.* VI ¹).

And if the origin of temple singing and temple psalmography be due to Canaanite impulses—as Psalm criticism has at length emphasized—, the Canaanites must obviously also have possessed all the cultic equipment required by such temple singing. There is a welcome verification of this point. It seems to be an ascertained fact that "singers" (*šārīm*) formed a class of temple personnel at Ugarit *ca.* 1400 B.C. ²).

Likewise we are grateful to have ALBRIGHT point out (without reference to Ugarit) that *'eṣrāḥī*, used about the eponym Heman (1 Chron. ii 6; Ps. lxxxviii 1), means "native", so that the O. T. itself verifies the old conjecture that Heman, Calcol and Darda (1 Kings iv 31) are pre-Israelite types of wise men ³).

We must agree entirely with ALBRIGHT, when he maintains that these things "do not prove that David organized the first religious music in Israel. Still less do they show that any of the Psalms go back to the time of David. They prove only that Hebrew temple music may go back to early times, and rests on pre-Israelite traditions and impulses" ⁴). There is reason to emphasize this, because ALBRIGHT nevertheless expresses himself as if the very fact that there existed a Ugaritic religious literature and ordered temple singing before the immigration of Israel, and that the half-nomadic ancestors of the Israelites were known for their musical skill, would increase the *probability* of certain Psalms being composed by David. But as yet no critic—and no person in his senses for that matter—has rejected Davidic authorship on the ground that the Israelites at the time of David did not yet have any knowledge of music, poetry or the art of writing. The question whether any of the extant Psalms may have

¹) In this connection GUNKEL, as well as the present writer, has referred to the mention of King Hezekiah's singers of both sexes on the Taylor cylinder, cf. *Ps. St.* VI, p. 38.

²) S. ALBRIGHT, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, p. 209 n. 93a.

³) *Op. cit.*, pp. 127, 210.

⁴) Hardly, however, that this "was recognized in Israel" (*op. cit.*, p. 128); The Chronicler scarcely knew the original meaning of *'eṣrāḥī*; if he had, he would most certainly have abandoned such a tradition.

been composed by David is in exactly the same position after the Ugarit finds, as it has been among form- and cult-historical Psalm investigators for decades before the finds.

In this connexion another important point must be mentioned. Investigators could not help noticing points of contrast between *Psalms* and *prophets* with regard to both style and content. To earlier investigators, whose great discovery was the central position of the prophets in the religious history of Israel, and who would therefore naturally tend to exaggerate this point of view, it was a matter of course that priority must be given to the prophets, and that the psalmists were inspired by them. The statement by WELLHAUSEN is characteristic: "Ohne Jeremia wären die Psalmen nicht geschrieben" ¹⁾).

The great resemblance between the "enthronement Psalms" and Deutero-Isaiah was thought to be due to the fact that these psalmists had studied his "writings". *Vice versa*, the purely psalmodic style and note of many of Jeremiah's individually modelled sayings was considered evidence that these passages were not genuine. A closer investigation, already suggested by GUNKEL, has shown that the case was reversed; in this respect we may say that BAUMGARTNER's investigation of "die Klagegedichte Jeremias" ²⁾ pioneered the way. The psalmodic style was imitated by the prophets in quest of a new, effectual way of putting their message. The style of hymns as well as laments, public (national) psalms of lamentation as well as private (individual) ones is older than Deutero-Isaiah, Jeremiah ³⁾ and Isaiah (vi 3), and existed fully developed in their time, just as Amos already refers to the use of the Psalms in the service as a regular element of the latter (Am. v 23). Indeed, the piety of the Psalms provides the *background* of the actions of the prophets, and we must keep it in mind in order to understand them. This is a consequence of the fact that even the prophets (*n'bî'im*) as an organisation belonged to the temple personnel and played an instrumental part in the public cultus ⁴⁾).

3. The second characteristic of the more recent Psalm investigation is that from the time of GUNKEL onward it has sought to consider

¹⁾ WELLHAUSEN, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*⁶, Berlin 1907, p. 147.

²⁾ W. BAUMGARTNER, *Die Klagegedichte des Jeremia*, BZATW xxxii, 1917.

³⁾ S. MOWINCKEL, *Ps. St.* II, pp. 195 ff.; "Motiver og stilformer i profeten Jeremias diktning" *Edda* 26, 1926, pp. 233 ff.

⁴⁾ Cf. *Ps. St.* III pp., 4 ff., 14 ff.; AUBREY R. JOHNSON, *The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel*, Cardiff 1944.

systematically the psalmography of Israel in relation to the other religions of the Near East. At that time scholars had become acquainted with the great material of Egyptian, Babylonian-Assyrian, and gradually also Sumerian and Hittite Psalms, the cultic destination of which was beyond all doubt. It was not without significance that GUNKEL was one of the leaders of the so-called "religio-historical school", and in the *Einleitung in die Psalmen* parallels are constantly given from the undoubtedly earlier oriental psalmography; other investigators like C. CUMMING¹⁾, G. WIDENGREN²⁾ and others, besides J. BEGRICH himself³⁾, have published thorough-going monographs with comparisons between an individual psalm type and the corresponding Babylonian-Assyrian one. The results arrived at may be described briefly as follows. We find a far-reaching conformity not only of phraseology, use of metaphors and the like, but even between the various types and their places within a definite cultic situation. We find both hymns and psalms of lamentation and of thanksgiving, public as well as private; we meet the king as the central and representative figure, the prophetic official of the cultus, as the one who imparts the divine oracle given in the liturgy in reply to the prayers of congregation or individual, and so on. We may get an impression of this conformity by consulting the Index to GUNKEL-BEGRICH's *Einleitung* under the words "Aegyptisches" and "Babylonisches", occupying between them one and a half columns of references. Obviously it is not as a rule a question of an individual Israelite psalmist having imitated such or such a definite Babylonian or Egyptian psalms, but of participation in a common oriental tradition of religious, poetical style, based on analogous cultic situations and rituals much older than the origin of the historical people of Israel. Here we are face to face with a particular aspect of the general historical fact that Israel stepped into a cultural circle with fixed conventions, and adopted essential features from it in form and content, gradually adapting them to the spirit and demands of Yahwism.

¹⁾ C. CUMMING, *The Assyrian and the Hebrew Hymns of Praise* (Columbia Univ. Orient. Studies 12), New York 1934.

²⁾ GEO WIDENGREN, *The Accadian and the Hebrew Psalms of Lamentation, as Religious Documents*, Stockholm 1937.

³⁾ *Die Vertrauensäusserungen im israelitischen Klagelied des Einzelnen und in seinem babylonischen Gegenstück*, ZATW xlvi, 1928, pp. 221 ff.; *Die priesterliche Tora*, BZATW lxvi, 1938, pp. 63 ff.; *Das priesterliche Heilsorakel*, ZATW lii, 1934, 81 ff. Cf. the writer's critical remarks in *Offersang og sangoffer*, p. 575 n. 59, p. 582 n. 5, p. 583 n. 23, p. 584 n. 39 and 48.

According to what was known even then of the position of Canaan within the cultural circle of the Near East, it was a logically inevitable conclusion that the Canaanites had served as intermediaries, when Israel took over elements of common Oriental culture, and this was constantly confirmed by the archaeological investigations in Palestine itself, started before the first world war. In different fields it had been possible to point out the Canaanite background of religious customs and conceptions in Israel, for instance with regard to the natural basis of the three annual festivals, or of details in the Israelite sacrificial ritual, as has been proved by DUSSAUD ¹⁾.

It was then natural to conclude that the same thing must have been the case, when Israel took over the common oriental stylistic tradition in religious and cultic poetry. But here the source material was lacking, and so far investigators were reduced to searching for traces which might point in that direction. BÖHL ²⁾ and JIRKU ³⁾ fastened on the hymnic religious terms of the Amarna letters, used by the vassals of Pharaoh, when addressing their liege lord, "the good god", which made it seem probable that the style was borrowed from Canaanite-Egyptian hymnology, transferred to Pharaoh.

Now the Ugaritic texts have provided proof that there in fact existed such a Canaanite psalmography, and the long lists of phraseological and ideological similarities between Canaanite and Israelite religious poetry presented by PATTON and COPPENS (see below) prove that there is a historical connexion between them. It can likewise now be taken for granted that there are close historical connexions in style and ideology between this Canaanite religious poetry and the much older Babylonian and Egyptian cult ideology and psalmography. In this way, the Ugaritic texts have given us just what "psalm criticism between 1900 and 1935" had given us every reason to expect.

If the impulses to, and the style patterns of, psalmography were derived from the Canaanites, there is of course also a possibility that the Israelites may have adopted earlier Canaanite psalms, remodelling them according to the demands of Yahwism. That there is a question of this possibility with regard to the "sun-hymn" of Ps. xix A has

¹⁾ R. DUSSAUD, *Les origines cananéennes du sacrifice Israélite*, Paris 1921.

²⁾ FR. BÖHL, "Hymnisches und Rhythmisches in Amarnabriefen aus Kanaan", *Theol. Lit. blatt* 1914, Nr. 15, pp. 137 ff.

³⁾ A. JIRKU, "Kanaanäische Psalmenfragmente in der vorisraelitischen Zeit Palestinas und Syriens", *JBL* lii, 1933, p. 108.

been maintained by GUNKEL (in his commentary) as well as by the present writer (in *Ps. St.* VI). That H. L. GINSBERG has felt justified in maintaining the same thing with regard to Ps. xxix ¹), does not in point of principle alter the fact that the problem would have forced itself on us in this form without Ugarit, as a result of the position of Psalm investigation a couple of decades before the Ugaritic texts were found.

4. The Ugaritic texts have proved what we had every reason to believe even earlier, that before the immigration of Israel, the Canaanites possessed a cultic psalmography with all that this implies. The few specific examples as yet known to us seem to prove that this poetry was kept in the usual common oriental poetical style. The finds have added strength to the already most likely conjecture, that the Canaanites served as intermediaries when Israel adopted the traditional psalm style common to the orient, certainly however modifying it on essential points, especially, of course, with regard to religious ideas. On the basis of the scanty material, it is impossible for us to say *how* great the resemblance may have been between the Israelite version of the common stylistic tradition and the Canaanite one; we are unable to give any particulars as to the sort of types represented among the Canaanites, and the detailed structure of the different type patterns. It is *a priori* very likely that the earliest Israelite psalmography in no small degree consisted of remodellings of Canaanite originals—this too is a consequence of the form- and cult-historical view with its common oriental orientation. This *direct* dependence on Canaanite patterns is certainly also the reason why this earliest cultic poetry has been utterly forgotten—not, as ALBRIGHT suggests (*op. cit.*, p. 129), because they "failed to measure up to later standards of taste", but because they were *too* Canaanite and not consistent with Yahwistic purism, which as early as the time of King Asa gained the ascendancy at the temple at Jerusalem ²).

The Ugarit texts have also corroborated the conclusion arrived at

¹) H. L. GINSBERG, *Kitvê Ugarit*, 1936, pp. 129 ff. (inaccessible to me); *Atti del XIX Congresso Internazionale Orientalisti*, 1938, pp. 472 ff.

²) In this connection ALBRIGHT finds it "significant that scarcely one of the fragments of hymns preserved in the Pentateuch is repeated in the Psalter" (*op. cit.*, p. 129). The reason for this is not "chronological", but simply the fact that of the hymns preserved in the Pentateuch only Ex. xv is actually a cultic hymn; none of the others are "hymns" in a form- and cult-historical sense, whereas the Psalter in point of principle contains the treasure of cultic Psalms of the tradition.

by the present writer on the basis of the "enthronement Psalms" and later approved of by a growing number of Psalm investigators, namely that these Psalms testify to a complex of ideas with corresponding rites, forming part of the cultic drama of the harvest and New Year festival, the idea of Yahweh's entry as a victorious king after having once more conquered the powers of chaos, recreated the world and secured "salvation" to his people. In *Ps. St.* II the present writer has maintained that in all probability the pattern of this cultic drama was taken over from the Canaanites, who used to celebrate the victory and "enthronement" of Ba'al in a similar way. As has been pointed out by both HVIDBERG¹⁾ and KAPELRUD²⁾, the Ugarit texts give positive evidence of the fact that such a festival was the main festival of the Canaanites, and that the enthronement of Ba'al on the "mountain of the gods" "in the North" (Saphon) after the victory over Môt, the god of death and chaos, provides, as distinctly as could be desired, the background of the origin of "Yahweh's enthronement festival". The Ugarit texts thus have on many points given us welcome corroboration of earlier well-founded hypotheses of Psalm criticism "between 1900 and 1935".

Apart from this, the real and greatest importance of the Ugarit texts to Psalm investigation lies in three domains: 1) they provide us with the Canaanite background of many of the mythical conceptions and metaphors contained in the Psalms as in all other Hebrew poetry, and also give interesting parallels to many religious ideas, as the Egyptian and Babylonian texts have also done; 2) they give an abundance of contributions, as yet far from exhausted, to lexicography, grammar, poetical phraseology and so on, in the Psalms as well as in Hebrew literature of other descriptions; 3) they give interesting and illuminating analogies to the numerous versions of the mode of composition called "thought-rhyme" (*parallelismus membrorum*) common to all poetry of the ancient Near East, and thus show us the types, which broadly speaking seem to have been the immediate patterns of the Israelite poets. On these three points only a few words can be added here.

In illustration of point 1. may be mentioned the conception of creation as being the victory of Yahweh over the primordial dragon of the primeval ocean or over the primeval ocean, as we find it in

1) FL. FR. HVIDBERG, *Graad og Latter i Det Gamle Testament*, København 1938.

2) A. S. KAPELRUD, *Jahves tronstigningsfest og funnene i Ras Sjamra*, NTT 1940, pp. 38 ff.

several psalms (lxxiv, lxxxix, civ), in Deutero-Isaiah, in the poem of Job and the Psalm of Habakkuk (chap. iii). Ever since GUNKEL's fundamental investigation ¹⁾ it has been generally supposed that it was derived from the Babylonian myth about Tiamat. CASSUTO has proved ²⁾ that the conception of Hab. iii contains clear reminiscences of the Ugaritic myth of Ba'al's fight with the primordial dragon, Sea (*ym*), or River (*nhr*). This does not, however, preclude the correctness of the earlier conception, as we have strong reason to believe that in the last instance even the Ugaritic myth is derived from the same—probably Sumerian—source as the Babylonian one. The fact that the Israelite version of the myth is evidently meant to be a tale about creation, whereas this does not seem to be the case with the Ugaritic one, also indicates that the Israelite version has been directly influenced from the East.

Another well-known example is the conception of Ba'al as "the sky-rider" (*rkb 'rpt*), transferred to Yahweh in Ps. lxxviii 5. A third one is the geographical and cult-historical origin of the conception of Saphon, the North, as the "mountain of the gods", Ps. xlviii 3. PATTON ³⁾ has given a great many examples of correspondence in religious ideas.

But on this point we have got to keep in mind that as a rule there is only a question of common phenomenological elements, such as for instance that the deity has a connexion with heaven, represents "justice", takes care of the helpless, rewards his worshippers, and so on, elements which have long ago been illustrated by means of Babylonian-Assyrian and Egyptian parallels. And likewise we have to keep in mind what COPPENS has emphasized ⁴⁾ in this connection: "Le choix d'un mot synonym peut être révélateur d'une tout autre mentalité ou idéologie".

As for 2., the poetic phraseology, PATTON and COPPENS have both given us a long line of corresponding passages, which also confirm the conjecture that the religious poetry of Canaan was the immediate pattern of that of Israel, though this does not of course preclude the possibility that the latter in some case or other may have built on a

¹⁾ H. GUNKEL, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, Göttingen 1895.

²⁾ U. CASSUTO, "Il capitolo 3 di Abaquet e i testi di Ras Samra", in *Annuario di Studi Ebraici* 1935/37, Roma, pp. 9 ff.

³⁾ J. H. PATTON, *Canaanite Parallels in the Book of Psalms*, Baltimore 1944.

⁴⁾ J. COPPENS, "Les Parallèles du Psautier avec les Textes de Ras Shamra-Ougarit", in *Bull. voor Geschiedenis en Exegese van het Oude Testament* 18, Louvain 1946, pp. 116 ff.

Babylonian or Egyptian original; this last possibility is rather likely, as far as Ps. civ is concerned ¹⁾.

But even here we have to remember that the phraseological conformity with Babylonian-Assyrian psalms is hardly less pronounced, and that even here we have to do with common oriental tradition.

We need not here go into further details with regard to the contributions of the Ugaritic texts to a better understanding of Hebrew lexicography and grammar. Investigators like ALBRIGHT, H. L. GINSBERG, and others have already given an abundance of new contributions in a series of separate investigations, and new material is to be found in almost every number of the scientific publications concerned with Ugaritica and Biblica. We have every reason to be grateful for this.

So also for 3. the contributions towards the elucidation of Hebrew versification, which especially GINSBERG ²⁾ and CYRUS GORDON ³⁾ have drawn from the Ugaritic texts. It has to be emphasized, however, that this does not apply to the metrical art itself. What has hitherto been said of Ugaritic as well as of Hebrew metrics has been under the ban of the system of SIEVERS, and shows no understanding of the elementary, fundamental rules of Hebrew metrics ⁴⁾. But the demonstration of the finer shades in the use of *parallelismus membrorum* and of the different patterns for the latter, is valuable. Not least so the many variation of the so-called climactic or repetitive parallelism.

5. But here we have every reason to warn against drawing premature conclusions from the evidence, especially concerning Psalm chronology and the date of the prevalence of Ugaritic influences on the Psalms. In his above-mentioned paper GINSBERG has also pointed out that "tricola", occurring irregularly between normal bicola, are common in Ugaritic epic style and that they often have the structure of the climactic type; he also holds that this climactic tricolon is com-

¹⁾ Cf. G. NAGEL, "A propos des rapports du Psaume 104 avec les textes égyptiennes" in *Bertholetfestschrift*, Tübingen 1950, pp. 395 ff.

²⁾ H. L. GINSBERG in *Orientalia* V, 1936.

³⁾ C. H. GORDON, *Ugaritic Grammar*, Roma 1940, pp. 78 ff.

⁴⁾ ALBRIGHT (*The Robinson Jubilee Volume*, p. 5) speaks of "the two-beat metre of the Song of Miriam". A two-beat metre does not exist in Hebrew. The metre in Ex. xv is a dipodic four-beat metre, the "bicolon", containing 4 + 4 "pedes", with thought-rhyme between the two cola of the bicolon, very often also between 2 and 2 bicola, which thus form "stanzas".

mon in the earlier poetry of the O.T. ALBRIGHT asserts that "it is common in the earlier psalms, very rare in the later ones". "In the Bible we have exceedingly elaborate examples of repetitive or climactic parallelism in the Song of Deborah." "The same type of parallelism appears in the . . . Song of Miriam." "This striking agreement in style between these two early triumphal songs and the Canaanite epic poems of the early fourteenth century B.C. cannot be accidental" ¹).

ALBRIGHT may be right in putting Judges v in the same "class of triumphal poems" "as the poem relating the alleged triumph of Ramesses II of Kadesh on the Orontes in 1296 and the stirring poem describing the victory of Tukulti-Ninurta I of Assyria over the Cossaeon Kashtiliash of Babylon, about 1220 B.C." ²).

But that the Song of Miriam "is substantially Mosaic in date" and "probably goes back to the thirteenth century B.C.", is a perfectly untenable position. The last stanza (v. 17 f.) as obviously as could be desired points to the temple of Jerusalem, and this is in no wise refuted, as ALBRIGHT thinks ³) by the fact that the term "the mountain of Thine inheritance" has been borrowed from Canaan and that even in the Canaanite epic the home of Ba'al is said to have been "on the mountain of his inheritance"; for in both cases a definite mountain must be meant, in Ugarit, Mount Saphon, in Israel, Mount Zion; the fact that the phrase is old and of Canaanite origin is not incompatible with its use in Ex. xv of Zion, nor can it prove that Ex. xv must be an old poem. In archaeology a single potsherd may perhaps suffice to prove the age of an archaeological stratum; but in philology and the history of literature this method cannot be used. We may further argue against ALBRIGHT that Ex. xv is "no triumphal poem" in the same sense as Judges v and the two above-mentioned Egyptian and Assyrian poems. Ex. xv is a regular festal cult-hymn, using "hymn" in the sense which it has in the form- and type-criticism of GUNKEL and his followers. Of really ancient Israelite poetry, which might be used as an evidence that the above mentioned tricolitic-climactic form must be referred to a definite period of Israelite poetry, as ALBRIGHT thinks, we have, therefore, just one (one!)

¹) *Robinson Jubilee Volume*, pp. 3 ff.

²) *Op. cit.*, p. 5, cf. *BASOR* 62 (April 1936), p. 20: "The Song of Deborah in the Light of Archaeology". ALBRIGHT's date for the poem may be correct; it seems, however, obvious that the historical events are later than the migration of Dan to the north.

³) *The Archaeology of Palestine*, p. 233.

example. Again, we may point out that in the history of literature a single potsherd is no proof. Equally we must warn against drawing *chronological conclusions* about the age of individual psalms from the evidence. ALBRIGHT himself is aware that Canaanitisms, both with regard to material and style, are to be found in early as well as in late Biblical poetry; like CASSUTO he very strongly stresses the Canaanite material in Hab. iii, the date of which can be fixed with certainty between 605 and 589 B.C. Accordingly he rightly says that "in principle we cannot, therefore, establish any definite correlation at present between the date of a Psalm and its Canaanite content". But judging "from the fact that Canaanite parallels abound in the Songs of Deborah and the Lament of David over Saul and Jonathan, that they cease almost entirely in the prophetic literature (sic!) of the eighth century and emerge in great abundance not far from 600 B.C.", he is "inclined to attribute most of the Psalms with Canaanite colouring either to the sixth-fourth centuries B.C. or to the eleventh-tenth centuries" ¹).

In further proof of this, apparently, he maintains that the tricolliclimactic style "seems to appear chiefly in archaic hymns of the Psalter". As particularly convincing examples of "archaic hymns" he mentions Pss. xxix, lxvii, lxxvii, xcii-xcvi, whereas the same forms "in the late liturgical Ps. cxviii 15 f., 25" are supposed to be archaisms which "are in striking lack of logical connection with the context, and were presumably taken over from an older psalm or psalms" ²).

On this the following observations may be made. All later exegetes probably agree that Ps. xxix is a very old Psalm, even if they do not all feel convinced by GINSBERG's arguments that it is "a relatively little changed adaptation of a Ba'al hymn to the cult of Yahweh" (ALBRIGHT's wording). Even here one has to allow for the power of stylistic tradition rather than direct literary adaptation ³).

¹) *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, pp. 128 f.

²) *The Robinson Jubilee Volume*, pp. 6 f.

³) Ps xxix is interpreted in a too restricted sense, if it is supposed to be just a description of the revelation of Yahweh in a thunderstorm, even if the *qôl* of the god both in the O.T. and in Ugarit may indicate thunder. The Psalm speaks of the miracle-working, destroying or creating voice of Yahweh in all its manifestations, and therefore ends by mentioning His victorious cry against the primeval ocean, over which He has erected His throne, whence He rules as a king in all eternity and blesses His people (Israel) with "peace" and all good things. To look upon v. 11, which together with v. 10 makes up the last of the 6 quite regularly constructed stanzas of the Psalm, as a later addition, is like taking away the real point of the whole Psalm.

Of Ps. lxxvii ALBRIGHT says that it "presumably goes back in nucleus, at least, to the Tabernacle cultus". That is absolutely impossible. The Psalm is a public thanksgiving Psalm for the crop of the earth, with which Yahweh has even this year blessed His people and thus proved that He reigns ("judges") the earth and all the nations with justice. The Psalm, therefore, presupposes that Israel is an agricultural people; nothing is said of cattle breeding. Detaching a "nucleus", supposed to be older than the Psalm as a whole, is nothing but an arbitrary act, of which there are no indications either from the point of view of logic or of style. The world-wide universalism (all nations are governed by Yahweh, they will all join in thanking Him for His benefits and in fearing Him to the ends of the world) indicates relatively late times.

Ps. lxxvii is a probably North-Israelite (cf. "Jacob"; "Joseph" v. 16) psalm of lamentation in public distress: the worshipper represents the people; even here we find an element of reflection and conflicts of faith, showing that we must not go too far back in time. But I agree with ALBRIGHT (if I understand him properly) that the hymnic section in different tricollic metre (vv. 17-20) is a fragment of an earlier hymn, used by the author as a "motivation of the prayer" ("Gebetserhörungs-motiv"), and likewise that the theophany has been conventionalised in conformity with the struggle of the primordial ocean and therefore displays most ancient features. It is just the traditional style of theophany, and cannot be used as a chronological criterion.

Ps. xcii is an individual thank-offering Psalm, the worshipper is probably the king, who has been victorious over his enemies. But the manner of suggesting that the righteous reign of Yahweh has become something of a problem to the pious (v. 7), and the impressing of individual retributive justice (vv. 3, 13 f.), prove that it cannot belong to the earlier naive and optimistic times; it belongs to an age approaching the problem of theodicy, with which, for instance, Ps. lxxiii and other Psalms deal directly.

Ps. xciii may well be pre-exilic, as the present writer has strongly emphasized in *Ps. St. II*. Here too the theme is the victory over the primeval ocean and the creation, which has become a new reality through Yahweh's appearance at the cultic festival. The Psalm does not contain any criteria for a more accurate dating, apart from the metrical *petitio principii*.

Ps. xciv is a national psalm of lamentation, the second part of

which (*vv.* 16 ff.) is kept in the I-form: the worshipper is the head of the people and represents the latter in the cultus. The distress complained of is due to external enemies—a pagan potentate, “the throne of iniquity, which *frameth* mischief against (established) law”, or “cosmic order” (*hōq*)¹ (*v.* 20)—and their co-operators among the Israelites (*v.* 8); it seems to be in the nature of permanent oppression rather than acute attack; the Psalm also complains of the arrogant and (from Israelite point of view) blasphemous turn of speech, and of the oppression of common people and disregard of the God of Israel. Mixing the styles of lamentation and wisdom poetry, the author partly turns to Yahweh with lamentations over the conduct of the enemies (*vv.* 1-7), partly addresses his words to the enemies themselves (cf. *lii* 3 ff.) and argues with them, as if they ought really to agree with him, with his religious outlook and his opinions (*vv.* 8-11). Indirectly these words also involve an appeal to Yahweh to see and hear and interfere. By way of contrast with these “fools”, he praises (still in the style of wisdom) the man who receives the chastisement and education of Yahweh, as he himself and his people are doing (*vv.* 12 f.); in the context this idea is in the nature of a “motive of confidence”, followed up by a direct profession of confidence in *vv.* 14 ff.—The supposed historical and political situation, as well as the strong element of reflection and wisdom style, seem to point to relatively late times in the history of Israel and of psalmography. The Psalm may be dated from the later period of the monarchy (the age of Assyrians or Chaldeans), but possibly from the time of the Persians. If the latter, the worshipper is not the king, but may be the governor of the province.

Ps. xcvi, with regard to structure and place in the cultus, is evidently a parallel Psalm to lxxxi: the festival of the renewal of the covenant, i.e. the festival of harvest and New Year. In the style of the prophetic word, it emphasizes the oburgation much more strongly than lxxxi, which puts the main stress on the admonition to faithfulness to the covenant and on the promise. This seems to indicate that xcvi is somewhat later than lxxxi. In xcvi 1-7 the theme for doxology is the creation of the universe and Yahweh's guidance of His people throughout history; even this universalistic note distinguishes it from the purely national Ps. lxxxi. This psalm is probably a North-Israelite festal liturgy (Jacob, Joseph *vv.* 5 f.), handed down in a

¹ Cf. the writer's paper “The Hebrew Equivalent of Taxo in Ass. Mos. ix”, in *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum*, Vol. I, Leiden 1953, pp. 90 ff.

Judaic edition ¹⁾. All this seems to suggest a late pre-exilic (or early post-exilic) date for xcv.

It is impossible to say anything definite about the date of the typical enthronement Psalm xcvi. That the type itself is older than Deutero-Isaiah has been proved by the present writer in *Ps. St.* II; but nothing is thereby implied about any individual example of the type. It may just as well be late pre-exilic as early post-exilic.

I cannot, however, see that there is any reason to consider Ps. cxviii to be “late” because of its being “liturgical”, as ALBRIGHT thinks. All Psalms are “liturgical” in the sense of “cultic”. It is a festal Psalm of procession and thanksgiving at the New year festival; the object of thanksgiving is the merciful help of Yahweh throughout the history of Israel, presented in a concentrated way by means of the conventionalized metaphors of the three stanzas, vv. 10-14. That vv. 15-16 and 25 stand “in striking lack of logical connexion with the context” is a perfectly groundless assertion. V. 15 b is just a verbatim duplicate of v. 15 c, rightly lacking n 1 Hebr. MS and in several Greek MSS. 15 c + 16 a are the wording of the *qôl rinnâh wîšû‘âh*, heard in the “tents of the righteous” (i.e. the Israelites), and also in the festal procession. Together 14-16 make up one of the regularly constructed stanzas (2 bicola) of the Psalm. In v. 25 the festal procession has entered the temple court and pronounces the formula of prayer (v. 25) for happiness at the festival and for the future. The prayer receives its logical and necessary answer through the blessing formula of the priests (the temple guards) on “those coming” (generic singular) all who are now entering the sanctuary. Vv. 25 and 26, indicating prayer and answer, together make up a logically coherent stanza, which is again answered by the hymnic v. 27a with mutual invitations on the part of the participants in the festival to close the dancing ranks right up to the altar, all the dancers touching each other with the festal branches (*‘bôfîm*), while the foremost touches the altar with his branch, so that the current of blessing may flow from the altar to the very last participant in the procession.

I have discussed these psalms apart from the fact that many of the “tricola” of MT and of GINSBERG and ALBRIGHT require thorough textual criticism. Such criticism of Ps. cxvii 16 proves that they may actually be illusory (see above).

¹⁾ Cf. the writer’s *Offersang og sangoffer*, p. 586 n. 90.

We see, therefore, that the supposed "archaic hymns" of ALBRIGHT are dispersed over the entire period of the psalmography, and so do not allow of any stylistic historical chronology. Consequently, the occurrence of highly mythological elements of Canaanite origin in Ps. xviii is no proof that the psalm is derived from the 10th century B.C. ¹⁾

The same thing applies to Ps. lxxxix, which is a royal Psalm, but in all probability from the later part of the period of the monarchy. For the dating it is of no importance whatsoever that among the Korahite Psalms lxxxviii and lxxxix have been ascribed to Heman and Ethan respectively; this tradition, which ALBRIGHT himself admits to be "post-exilic", merely implies that the Korahites ascribed the authorship of the Psalms of their guild to the ancestors they had adopted from Canaanite tradition, and that the above-mentioned two Psalms happened to be explicitly furnished with the names of Heman and Ethan ²⁾:

Even if it should prove correct that lxxxviii "swarms with Canaanitisms", its view of the dead is purely Yahwistic as opposed to the way the earlier Semites looked upon the dead as "the mighty ancestors", from whose graves blessing poured forth ³⁾.

As the above survey shows, the Canaanite material in the Psalms is rather evenly distributed all over the religious and literary history of Israel, which is evidenced by Deutero-Isaiah, Job and Hab. iii. This is, in fact, quite natural, as long as the material had been entirely assimilated by the spirit of Yahwism, and what was not assimilated was expelled at a time previous to any of the Psalms preserved to us (see above, p. 23). From a cult-historical point of view it is quite out of the question that psalms which were originally too Canaanite were at a later point of time "taken over by the official cult of Yahweh" ⁴⁾, that is to say that they were not originally destined for the cultus. By the nature of the case, and as one of the sure results of *Gattungsforschung*, we know that psalmography in Israel, as in all other places, sprang into life just in order to serve the cultus; and with negligible exceptions all the extant Psalms are real and original cult Psalms. If they could not have been taken over by the official cult "until the time of David or later" ⁴⁾, they could not have been composed be-

¹⁾ As ALBRIGHT thinks, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, p. 129.

²⁾ Cf. MOWINCKEL, *Ps. St.* VI, pp. 41-45.

³⁾ Cf. JOHS. PEDERSEN, *Israel, its Life and Culture* III-IV, Copenhagen-London 1940, pp. 477-486.

⁴⁾ ALBRIGHT, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, p. 129.

fore that time, for they were composed for the official cult and for no other reasons ¹⁾).

¹⁾ How far off from the type- and cult-historical point of view ALBRIGHT stands is seen from the fact that he speaks of "the short psalm at the beginning of II Sam. 23" (*Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, p. 126). 2 Sam. xxiii 1-7 is no "psalm" at all but an artificial prophecy in the enigmatic form of the last words of the dying ancestor; cf. Gen. xlix; Dtn. xxxiii. The style is a mixture of prophetic and "wisdom" motifs. For Davidic authorship ALBRIGHT gives no other reason than "the fact that it begins exactly like the two archaic poems of Balaam in Num. 24". As if artificial archaisms were an unknown thing in the poetry of any nation! Cf. the writer's paper "Die letzten Worte Davids", 2 Sam. xxiii 1-7, in *ZATW*. lv, 1927, pp. 30 ff.

THE CALENDAR OF THE BOOK OF JUBILEES, ITS ORIGIN AND ITS CHARACTER

BY

JULIAN MORGENSTERN

Cincinnati

I. The Calendar of Jubilees and Its Problem

In a recent study of the calendar of Jubilees by Mlle. A. JAUBERT ¹⁾, a study of interest and scientific value, the author raises two basic questions; Was this calendar real and practicable, or only theoretical and artificial, and, Whence came this calendar; what was its source; was it truly an ancient Israelite calendar, as the Book of Jubilees itself claims that it was. After careful study the author reaches the conclusion that it was indeed, in a relatively early period in Israel's history, the official calendar of the people, but that it was ultimately displaced by the lunar calendar, which with certain minor modifications, is still the official religious calendar of Judaism. However, this shift from the older to the younger calendar was, so it is claimed, resisted by the priesthood, who stubbornly and desperately preserved this calendar until it eventually was permanently recorded in both Jubilees and 1 Enoch ²⁾. This calendar persisted in official use by that Jewish sect whose writings are being brought to light today by the archaeological investigation of the several caves near the north-western end of the Dead Sea, in which they had been deposited some two thousand years ago.

The author bases her conclusions quite naturally primarily upon Biblical evidence, culled for the most part from the books of the Hexateuch, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles. In using the Hexateuchal material, however, she disregards completely the well-established conclusions of Biblical Science with regard to the relative ages and cultural backgrounds of the various literary strata of the Hexateuch. Neither does she take into consideration all the significant evidence bearing upon the history of the calendar in ancient Israel

¹⁾ "Le calendrier des Jubilés et de la secte de Qumrân. Ses origines bibliques", VT III (1953), 250-264.

²⁾ 1 Enoch lxxii-lxxx.

which the Biblical writings make available. Had she done so, she would certainly have realized that at least three, and probably even four, different calendars were officially employed in Israel at various moments during the thousand-years period of its history which the Biblical literature covers ¹⁾. And had she come to this realization, her second question, by far the more essential of the two questions which she poses, would have received this formulation: With which calendar of ancient Israel, if any, does the calendar of Jubilees have basic affinities. To this question we would direct our initial attention.

Certainly one of the distinctive characteristics of the Book of Jubilees is the fundamental role which the number seven plays in it ²⁾. It is undeniable that this number had a unique significance, not only in ancient Israelite, but also in general, ancient Semitic, thought, speculation and cult practice. But it is equally undeniable that in the Book of Jubilees, in its basic thought and in the various institutions which it seeks to enforce, the number seven plays an extraordinary role. This is the case particularly in its system of time-reckoning, as the following table reveals:

7 days = a week
52 weeks (364 days) = a year
7 years = a "week" of years
7 weeks of years (49 years) ³⁾ = a jubilee.

Moreover, from the creation of Adam to the "present day" of the Book of Jubilees was exactly 49 jubilees, in other words, a "jubilee of jubilees" ⁴⁾.

Furthermore, as has just been indicated, the year of Jubilees consists of 364 days, that is of exactly 52×7 days or 52 weeks ⁵⁾. This year is divided into 12 months of 30 days each, with four intercalary days, one inserted after every third month. The result of this procedure is that each quarter of the year consists of exactly 91 days, or 13 weeks. Manifestly then the week runs consecutively through

¹⁾ MORGENSTERN, "The Three Calendars of Ancient Israel", *Hebrew Union College Annual* (hereafter cited as *HUCA*) I (1924) 13-78; "Additional Notes on the Three Calendars of Ancient Israel", *HUCA* III (1926), 77-107; "Supplementary Studies in the Calendars of Ancient Israel", *HUCA* X (1935), 1-148; "The Chanukkah Festival and the Calendar of Ancient Israel", *HUCA* XX (1947), 1-136; XXI (1948), 365-496.

²⁾ v 24; xxxii 21, and *passim*.

³⁾ And not fifty years, as in Lev. xxv 8 ff.; cf. Jub. iv 29-30; x 16; xix 7; xxiii 8; xxxv 6, 27; xlv 13; cf. also the article of J. and H. LEWY cited on p. 37, n. 2.

⁴⁾ l 4.

⁵⁾ v 27; vi 23-38; xxv 16.

the entire year, with the result that every successive year is uniform in that it begins always upon the same day of the week, and likewise each month begins from year to year upon the same day of the week. Moreover, each quarter of the year, consisting of exactly thirteen weeks or three months, is uniform in that the corresponding day within each quarter falls upon precisely the same day of the week. A moment's thought must make perfectly clear that, instead of adding the four intercalary days in a single group at the end of the year, as the natural procedure would seem to have been, the system of intercalating one day at the end of each quarter of the year was devised precisely in order to bring the week, running consecutively through the entire year, into perfect accord with the division of the year into twelve months. Furthermore, this year of 364 days is nominally, though of course not actually, a solar year. That the week of seven days is the fundamental element within this calendar should now be almost self-apparent.

Moreover, within this calendar year these four intercalated days, which divide the year into its four quarters, each in its turn, have positive festival character. Jub. vi 23-28 commands that they be celebrated regularly year by year as festal days of memorial, commemorating the significant events of the Flood episode which, according to the tradition here recorded, transpired upon each of these days ¹). This means that each of the four divisions of the year of this peculiar calendar begins or ends with a festival. It should be noted also that whereas in 1 Enoch lxxii these four intercalary days are reckoned as

¹) In this connection the following table, recording the events which, according to Jub., transpired upon these "memorial days", will be of more than ordinary import:

- | | |
|--------|--|
| I/1. | Noah bidden to build the ark; vi 25; cf. v 22.
Noah celebrates a festival, upon which he offers a sacrifice, drinks wine, and becomes drunk; vii 2 ff.
Abram erected an altar upon the mountain between Bethel and Ai and offered sacrifice; xiii 8.
Jacob came to Bethel upon his way to Harran, set up the stone there, and beheld the heaven open; xxvii 19 ff.
Levi born; xxviii 14. |
| IV/1. | Promise to Abram of the birth of Isaac; xvi 1.
Joseph born; xxviii 24.
Jacob arrived in Egypt; xlv 1. |
| VII/1. | Abram sat up throughout the night to observe the stars and from this augur the character of the year; xii 16.
Jacob goes to Bethel for the second time and offers sacrifice there; xxxi 1 ff. |
| X/1. | Jacob returned to his father, Isaac; xxxiii 1. |

the 31st day of the third, sixth, ninth and twelfth months respectively, Jub. v 23 reckons them as the 1st ¹⁾ of the first, fourth, seventh and tenth months. In this one, not too essential, respect, and apparently in this one respect alone, the calendars of Jubilees and 1 Enoch vary from each other.

In the light of these considerations the question of the possible antecedent of this calendar of the Book of Jubilees, and with it of the calendar of 1 Enoch also, reduces itself to this simple question: Do we know of any calendar ever employed in ancient Israel in which the number seven, the institution of the seven-day week, and the division of the year into periods each of a particular number of weeks, and each such period separated by a festival day from the period immediately following it, and with this the additional, larger time-units of seven years and of seven times seven years played a fundamental role comparable to that which they play in the calendar which we are now studying. Fortunately we do know of just such a calendar.

II. *The Pentecontad Calendar*

In 1943 Drs. JULIUS and HILDEGARD LEWY published a study of great interest and far-reaching significance "The Origin of the Week and the Oldest West Asiatic Calendar" ²⁾. In this study they established convincingly that a calendar which divided the year into seven periods of fifty days each was in vogue among the Semitic peoples of early Assyria, Babylonia, Syria and Palestine and was employed by Assyrian merchants in their Cappadocian business transactions from near the end of the third millennium B.C. and onwards.

This was essentially an agricultural calendar. Each of the seven periods of fifty days which comprised the year was known as a *ḥamuštu*, a "fifty". Each "fifty" was closely associated with a specific stage of the agricultural year and of the development of the various crops. But an agricultural calendar, no matter what its basis and form be, must of necessity take cognizance of the annual solar cycle of approximately three hundred and sixty-five and one quarter days.

¹⁾ And not "new moon" day, as CHARLES regularly translates it. Certainly in this ostensibly solar calendar of Jubilees, with its year consisting of three hundred and sixty-four days and its months of either thirty or thirty-one days, the first day of the month would have coincided with the day of the new moon only seldom and with no regularity whatsoever.

²⁾ *HUCA* XVII (1942-1943), 1-152.

Moreover, the solar divisions of the year, the four seasons, also play an essential role in agricultural life and therefore may not be disregarded completely in any truly agricultural calendar. Some method or system of compensation or equalization between the seven fifty-day periods, all totalling together three hundred and fifty days, and the true solar year was therefore indispensable in order to make this pentecontad calendar, as the LEWYS have very appropriately designated it, effective. In Assyria accordingly sixteen days and in Babylonia fifteen days were added to the seven fifty-day periods, thus making the actual calendar year in early Assyria total three hundred and sixty-six days and in early Babylonia three hundred and sixty-five days. This period of sixteen or fifteen days respectively was known as *šapattum*. In both countries this *šapattum* seems to have been incorporated into the calendar between the end of the winter "fifty" and the beginning of the "fifty" of the grain harvest.

Each *hamuštu*, it is plain, consisted of seven complete weeks plus one extra day. This day was celebrated as a festival, a festival which brought the *hamuštu* to a fitting close. In Palestine this festival was known by the generic name, *ʿašeret*, "conclusion". In the course of a year there were naturally seven such concluding festivals, one at the end of each *hamuštu*. Each such *ʿašeret* had its own specific name, so at least it seems. Each such festival stood completely outside the week, and so was designated by no week-day name or number but only by its particular festival name. Accordingly each *hamuštu* began upon the first day of the week and, in turn, reached its nominal end upon the forty-ninth day, which would of necessity be the seventh and final day of the seventh complete week of the *hamuštu*. Upon this followed immediately the *ʿašeret*, the concluding festival, the fiftieth day, the day which stood outside the week and brought the *hamuštu* to its official close. From this it is clear that in this calendar the week was the basic time-unit, and also that it ran consecutively through each *hamuštu*, though not through the entire year; for each *ʿašeret* at the end of the *hamuštu* necessarily interrupted the sequence of the weeks.

This pentecontad calendar went beyond this, however, in its system of time-reckoning. Altogether naturally, in the light of its manifest dependence upon the number seven, it linked seven years into a unit of time-reckoning, known in Accadian as *sibûtum*, "a seven". And, in turn, it joined seven such seven-year periods plus one additional year, a procedure corresponding to the organization

of the *hamuštu*, the period of fifty days, into its largest time-unit, one of fifty years, known as a *dârum*, plainly the antecedent of the Hebrew *dôr*.

The LEWYS have established that this calendar was probably of West Semitic, perhaps, more specifically, of Amorite, origin, and that it may even have been carried into the Mesopotamian lands by the Amorite conquerors of that area at some time within the final quarter of the third millenium B.C. This consideration suggests, in turn, that this calendar may well have been in general use in Palestine and adjacent lands from relatively early times. But the Palestinian form of this calendar differed in one significant respect from its Assyrian and Babylonian counterparts. Just as in Babylonia, the Palestinian pentecontad calendar year consisted of three hundred and sixty-five days, that is the seven fifty-day periods plus fifteen days. But unlike the Babylonian and Assyrian practice, this fifteen days supplement to the seven "fifties" was divided into two periods, one of seven days and the other of seven plus one days. Each of these two *šapattum* periods of the Palestinian pentecontad calendar consisted then of exactly one week, but with an additional day, the character of which will be determined later, appended to the one *šapattum*. This day too, precisely like the seven **šarôt*, stood outside the week.

From all this it is clear that the week was actually the basic time-unit of this pentecontad calendar, and also that, in principle at least, it ran consecutively through the entire year, and was supplemented by eight nameless, festival days, all standing outside the week, but by so doing emphasizing all the more the significance of the week as the basic time-unit of this pentecontad calendar.

This calendar was current among the early Canaanites and was borrowed from them by the Israelites when they settled in Palestine and learned from the Canaanites the techniques of agricultural civilization. The Bible then, and both the Old and the New Testaments, is a major source of information about the pentecontad calendar, as it was employed not only in Israel but also among their Canaanite predecessors.

The two *šapattum* periods, each actually of seven days', or one week's, duration, were the natural occasions for the observance of the two major festivals of the agricultural year. Each of these two festivals was celebrated during an entire *šapattum* period, that is for seven days. The one festival, known as the Festival of **Ašîf*, "In-gathering", was celebrated during the *šapattum* which followed

immediately upon the fourth "fifty". It began upon the day following the *'ašeret* of this "fifty", therefore upon what was equivalent to the first day of the week, and it ended upon the seventh day thereafter, upon what was tantamount to the final day of the week. As the name implies, this festival marked the close of the period of ingathering of the produce of fields and orchards, of the threshing of the grain and the pressing of the wine and oil and the storing of this for use during all the late autumn and winter periods until the crop of the next year would become ready for human use.

The other *šapattum* came at the close of the seventh "fifty". It too, like its counterpart, began upon the day following immediately upon the *'ašeret* of the seventh "fifty", therefore also upon what was tantamount to the first day of the week, and it too reached its end upon the seventh day, upon what was equivalent to the seventh day of the week. Moreover, inasmuch as it followed immediately upon the seventh and last "fifty" of the year, it is plain that it covered the final seven days of the year, that its week brought the year to a close. During this *šapattum* week the Festival of *Maššôt* or Unleavened Bread was celebrated. The Canaanites and likewise the early Israelites raised crops only sufficient in amount for their own family needs. Barter and commerce in agricultural products with peoples of other lands began only under David and were fostered through his close, cooperative relations with the Tyrians, who were just beginning to develop as a commercial people¹). Until that time neither the Canaanites nor the Israelites after them had had any incentive to raise crops in amount larger than they needed for self-maintenance. Just as was the established custom among many primitive peoples living upon the same stage of agricultural civilization, whatever surplus crops remained at the end of the year, when the crop of the new year became ready for consumption, had to be eaten sacramentally; and what could not be disposed of in this manner had to be burned. Under no condition might the new crop be mingled, or even be brought into contact, with the old crop, for, in firmly rooted folk-belief, the effect of this would have been to completely ruin the new crop, with the dire result that famine would ensue. Accordingly everything that remained of the old crop had to be put out of the way, either through sacramental eating or through burning, before the use of

¹) Cf. MORGENSTERN, "Amos Studies, III", *HUCA* XV (1940), 59-81; *Amos Studies*, I, 183-205.

the new crop might be begun. Into the reasons for this lack of space forbids us to enter here ¹⁾. What remained of the old crop at the commencement of this final week of the year was eaten sacramentally in the form of *maššôt* or unleavened bread, and, as has been stated, what could not be consumed thus had to be burned. In this manner all that remained of the old crop was disposed of. As has been said, the *Maššôt* Festival endured for seven days, the seven days of this second annual *šapattum*, the last seven days of the year.

But since the seven days of this *šapattum*, the seven days of the *Maššôt* Festival, brought the old year to a close, it follows that the next day, the day which followed immediately upon the *šapattum*, must have been observed as the New Year's Day. Naturally it was a day of paramount importance and was celebrated with distinctive rites, into which, however, we may not enter here. Of one of these rites only must we make specific mention. Upon this New Year's Day, the day immediately following the *šapattum* ²⁾, and therefore likewise the day following immediately upon the close of the *Maššôt* Festival, the people would go out to their fields and with proper ceremonial would cut the first sheaf of the new crop and solemnly offer it as a firstfruit sacrifice. This sacrifice redeemed the entire new crop in principle and that first grain of the season to ripen in fact ³⁾

¹⁾ For a full treatment of this entire matter cf. MORGENSTERN, "The Origin of the Maššoth and the Maššoth-Festival", *The American Journal of Theology* XXI (1917), 275-293.

²⁾ Cf. Lev. xxiii 10 f., 15. The LEWYS equate, and basically with unchallengeable correctness, the term *šabbat* in the oft-discussed Hebrew expression, *mimmoh'rat hašabbat*, with the Accadian *šapattum*; *op. cit.*, 78 ff., 105 f.

³⁾ In principle the first sheaf or the first fixed measure of each separate grain as it ripened had to be offered as a sacrifice in order to remove the taboo thought to rest inherently upon that particular crop, to redeem it and render it fit for profane use. However, the harvest season was far too busy a period to permit the Canaanite or Israelite farmers to interrupt their field activities every time they began to harvest a different grain in order to repair to their local sanctuaries and there, with proper ceremony, offer the firstfruit sacrifice of that particular grain. The grain-harvest season extended in principle, and speaking broadly in fact also, through the entire seven weeks or forty-nine days of the first *hamuštu*, the first "fifty", of the new year. Accordingly the practice arose of setting aside the first sheaf of each kind of grain as it ripened as something *kadôš*, something sacred or taboo, and of holding these through the entire "fifty" until the *šeret*, the festival day which brought the "fifty" to a solemn close. Upon this festival day all the accumulated first sheaves were carried to the sanctuary and were there offered up in conventional manner as the harvest- or firstfruit-sacrifice. Accordingly this particular *šeret* at the end of the first "fifty" of the new year, the fiftieth day after the cutting of the very first sheaf of the new grain, was known and celebrated as the *šag haqašir*, "the Festival of the Harvest" (Ex. xxiii 16) or as *šag*

from the taboo which naturally rested upon it, and rendered it fit for daily, human use. With that act and upon that day the eating of the new crop began. For a people living upon a strictly agricultural plane of civilization this day of eating the very first portion of the new crop to ripen was truly the fitting and logical day for commencing the new year, for the New Year's Day celebration.

Moreover, this New Year's Day, following, as has been emphasized, immediately upon the *šapattum*, the seven sacred days, at the close of the old year, was the eighth day of this festival period, the eighth day, which brought the number of the days of the year to three hundred and sixty-five, and thus equated the pentecontad calendar year with the solar year. It too, quite naturally, as a day of distinctive character and having its own distinguishing name, stood outside the week, and so was reckoned as an independent time-unit in itself within the course of the year.

Accordingly the year of this pentecontad calendar was organised in the pattern as shown in the table on p. 43.

Examination of this tabular representation of the pentecontad year brings out a number of significant facts quite vividly.

Each "fifty" consisted of exactly forty-nine days, or seven weeks, plus a fiftieth day, the day of the *ʿašeret*, the festival which brought the "fifty" to a solemn close. Each "fifty" commenced upon the first day of the week. The fiftieth day was a nameless day, at least insofar as the days of the regular week were concerned, in that, coming immediately after the seventh and final day of the seventh week of the "fifty", it itself stood entirely outside of the week and was known only by its festival name. It was this arrangement which made it possible for each "fifty" to begin upon the first day of the week.

Each *šapattum* consisted likewise of seven days, or one full week, and followed directly upon the *ʿašeret* of the "fifty" immediately preceding. Accordingly each *šapattum* too began upon the first day of the week and ended upon the seventh day thereof.

The New Year's Day, the day of cutting the first sheaf of the new crop, also, like the *ʿašarôt*, stood outside the week, and followed

habikkurim, "the Festival of Firstfruits" (Ex. xxxiv 22; Num. xxviii 26). In time, as we shall learn, it came to be known as *ḥag hašabu'ôt*, "the Festival of Weeks". The act of setting the first sheaf of each separate grain aside for eventual sacrifice permitted the immediate use of that crop for profane purpose, quite as if the sacrifice had actually been offered and thus the natural taboo resting upon it had been formally removed.

immediately after the *šapattum* which brought the year to a close. Beyond all question this day was the most sacred occasion of the entire year and, when linked, as it must necessarily have been, with the *šapattum* which immediately preceded it and during which the *Maššôt* Festival was celebrated, it constituted a sacred period of

Day of cutting the first sheaf—New Year's Day	1 day
1st "Fifty"—Grain Harvest	49 days
' <i>Ašeret</i> —Festival of Firstfruits— <i>Šabu'ôt</i>	1 day
2nd "Fifty"	49 days
' <i>Ašeret</i>	1 day
3rd "Fifty"	49 days
' <i>Ašeret</i>	1 day
4th "Fifty"	49 days
' <i>Ašeret</i>	1 day
<i>Šapattum</i> —Festival of Ingathering—' <i>Astf</i>	7 days
5th "Fifty"	49 days
' <i>Ašeret</i>	1 day
6th "Fifty"	49 days
' <i>Ašeret</i>	1 day
7th "Fifty"	49 days
' <i>Ašeret</i>	1 day
<i>Šapattum</i> — <i>Maššôt</i> Festival	7 days

eight days duration, a sacred period which signalized not only the end of the old, but also the commencement of the new year.

Quite manifestly the number seven was basic to this system of time-reckoning, and the week of seven days was the basic unit of this calendar. However, as has already been indicated, the week did not run consecutively through the entire year. It did run consecu-

tively through the first forty-nine days, or seven weeks, of each "fifty", only, however, to be interrupted by the *'ašeret* which brought that "fifty" to a close. Within the year there were seven "fifties" and also of course seven *'ašarôt*. Moreover, each *šapattum*, as has been stated, likewise consisted of exactly one week. Thus the pentecontad year equalled fifty-two complete weeks or three hundred and sixty-four days, plus the New Year's Day. It was actually this additional day, the three hundred and sixty-fifth day of the year, which approximately equated the pentecontad year with the solar year and thus made it a practical calendar for an agricultural people.

The New Year's Day was known in early Israel as "the Day of Bringing the Sheaf"¹⁾ or as the "Day of Beginning to Put the Sickle to the Standing Grain"²⁾. On the fiftieth day thereafter the *'ašeret* which terminated the first "fifty" of the new year, and which likewise coincided very closely with the completion of the grain harvest, "the Festival of the Harvest", also called "the Festival of Firstfruits"³⁾ was celebrated. Eventually, apparently so named by Deuteronomic writers, this festival came to be known as *Šabu'ot*, "the Festival of Weeks"⁴⁾ or "Pentecost".

It may be safely assumed that each successive "fifty" was, like this first "fifty", intimately associated with the particular seasonal agricultural activity which was preponderant in that period, and that correspondingly each *'ašeret* was known by a distinctive name fittingly related to the agricultural occupation dominant during the "fifty" which it terminated, and that it was celebrated in a manner closely akin thereto. We no longer know with certainty what the distinctive name, character and manner of celebration of each of these six remaining *'ašarôt* may have been, but that in principle and general character they paralleled closely the Festival of Firstfruits at the end of the first "fifty" we may be fairly certain.

A moment's thought must make clear that in this pentecontad calendar, at least in its original and basic form, there was no place whatever for the time-unit, month, whether a *yerah*, a solar month

¹⁾ Lev. xxiii 15; cf. v. 10.

²⁾ Deut. xvi 9; Cf. LEWY, *op. cit.*, 81, 110 and the Assyrian designation of the same occasion in the Assyrian form of the pentecontad calendar as *šibit nigallim*, "seizing the sickle", there cited.

³⁾ Ex. xxiii 16; xxxiv 22 (where the words, *šabu'ôt ta'aseh le'ka*, are quite plainly an interpolation by a Deuteronomic editor; cf. MORGENSTERN, "The Oldest Document of the Hexateuch", *HUCA* IV [1927], 78).

⁴⁾ Deut. xvi 9-10.

of thirty days ¹⁾, or a *hōdes*, a lunar month of twenty-nine days. Such a time-unit would have served no purpose which the "fifty" did not already serve, and would have thrown the calendar into inmeasurable confusion. We shall learn in due time exactly when the month became a basic unit in the Palestinian system of time-reckoning.

At this point it becomes a matter of extreme significance that that eminent authority upon the customs, superstitions, folk-beliefs and folk-practices of the Palestinian peasantry, T. CANAAN, writes as follows ²⁾:

"In some districts of Palestine the year is divided into seven periods of fifty days each. This division goes by the name, *es-sab(i)' chamsinât*, 'the seven fifties', and begins with Easter. I have found it in vogue everywhere in Southern Palestine. Fifty days are reckoned

From Easter to Pentecost,
From Pentecost to the 'Grape-watching',
From the 'Grape-watching' to the 'Grape-pressing',
From the 'Grape-pressing' to the Festival of Lydda,
From the Festival of Lydda to Christmas,
From Christmas to the period of fasting (i.e. Lent),
From the period of fasting to Easter.

Close examination of this division of the year discloses that the beginning and the end of each period is marked by an important festival. Thus the 'Grape-watching' begins with the Festival of Elijah, while the beginning of the 'Grape-pressing' coincides with the Festival of the Cross. This division of the year reveals the keen powers of observation of the peasant, for most of these sections consist of approximately fifty days."

Bearing upon this same theme DALMAN writes as follows ³⁾:

"Among the Christians of Palestine the festivals, especially when the emphasis is laid upon completion of agricultural activities, serve as measures of time, thus; the Easter fasting period, the 'Great Festival', which

¹⁾ Cf. the Biblical term, *yerah yamim*, "a month of days", Deut. xxi 13; 2 Ki. xv 13. That this means precisely thirty days is evidenced by the fact that in Deut. xxi 13 the term connotes the traditional period of mourning for the dead, while Num. xxx 29; Deut. xxxiv 8 state specifically that this traditional mourning period was thirty days. For thirty days as a definite and persistent unit of time-reckoning in Biblical writings composed long after the lunar calendar, with its months of both thirty and twenty-nine days had become official in the Jewish community of Palestine, cf. Esth. iv 11; Dan. vi 8, 13.

²⁾ "Der Kalender des palästinischen Fellachen", *ZDPV* 36 (1913), 272; cf. also p. 298.

³⁾ *Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina*, I, 8 f., 48-50, 181, 461 ff. Cf. also GRANT, *The People of Palestine*, 124; STEPHAN, "The Division of the Year in Palestine", *JPOS*, II (1922), 164 f.

concludes this period, often called simply 'The Festival', then Pentecost, in northern Palestine the Festival of Elijah on July 20, the Festival of the Cross on September 14, the Festival of St. George of Lydda on November 3, Christmas on December 25, and finally Epiphany on January 6, while New Year's Day receives little consideration; all this according to the Greek calendar, which lags thirteen days behind ours and which with regard to the date of Easter rests upon quite other considerations. It has been ascertained that approximately fifty days intervene between these festivals. In El-Ikbēbe the periods are reckoned from the Festival of the Cross to the Festival of St. George and from this to Epiphany, although the latter period actually covers sixty-four days. Epiphany should have been replaced by Christmas, as is indeed the case with 'the seven fifties', which Canaan reports for Southern Palestine. The Easter fasting period, Easter, Pentecost, grape-watching, grape-pressing, the Festival of St. George, and Christmas are thus distinguished. But the Festival of Elijah and the Festival of the Cross should really replace 'grape-watching' and 'grape-pressing'.....

"The Moslems, whose official calendar, with its lunar months, is independent of the solar year, and therefore can not be decisive for the activities of peasants and Bedouin, have adhered from ancient times to the time-reckoning by means of the Christian festivals. Already Muḩaddasī records that the Moslems thus employ Christmas and New Year's Day (as the beginning of the cold weather), Easter, Pentecost (as the beginning of the heat), the Festival of the Cross (as the time of grape-gathering), the Lydda Festival (as the beginning of sowing), the Festival of St. Barbara (December 4, as the beginning of the winter rains)."

That this Palestinian folk-calendar of "the seven fifties", employed by the peasants of Palestine, Christian and Moslem alike, to determine the incidence of their major festivals and with this the transition from one important stage of the annual agricultural program to the next, represents a survival in active and meaningful form down to the present day of the pentecontad calendar of their ancestors, the Semitic farmers of Palestine and neighboring lands of three thousand and more years ago, is almost self-apparent. This circumstance is easily comprehended. Farmers everywhere are inherently conservative and reactionary and stubbornly hold fast to ancient traditions, beliefs and cultic institutions long discarded and almost forgotten by the more progressive, urban population.

However, not only in the folk-practice of the Palestinian peasantry has the ancient, pentecontad calendar persisted in lively manner but also, and in some respects even more significantly, in the official calendar of Nestorian Christianity. Its year is divided into periods, each called a *šabū'ā*, a "seven". Actually, however, the Nestorian calendar no longer knows and employs all seven "fifties" of the

ancient pentecontad calendar. But it does know definitely and work with five of these. The LEWYS write ¹⁾:

“Around Easter the old, pentecontad system is clearly discernible: the so-called ‘Great Feast’ begins on the seventh Sunday before Easter and lasts for exactly seven weeks, as does the ‘*šabū‘ā* of Resurrection’, which comprises the time from Easter to Pentecost; the feast of Pentecost itself, which marks the end of this ‘*šabū‘ā*’, is at the same time the first day of the ‘*šabū‘ā* of the Apostles’, so named because it ends with the ‘Feast of the Twelve Apostles’, which falls on the seventh Sunday after Pentecost. The ‘*šabū‘ā* of the Apostles’, in turn, is followed by that of ‘Summer’, which likewise comprises seven Sundays ²⁾, the ‘Feast of the Twelve Apostles’ being counted as the first. Then follows the ‘*šabū‘ā* of Elias’, which also extends over exactly seven weeks. The remaining number of days (corresponding to the interval between the end of the ‘*šabū‘ā* of Elias’ and the beginning of the ‘Great Feast’), which formerly must have covered two further pentecontads and the *šapattum*, is now divided, in accordance with Christian festivals, into four further periods which, even though they retain the name of *šabū‘ā*, are, of course, considerably shorter than fifty days.

“One of the characteristic changes to which the pentecontad calendar was subjected by the Nestorian Christians deserves further discussion. As may be seen from the preceding enumeration of the five fully preserved *šabū‘ā*-periods before and after Easter, the festivals which once marked the beginnings and the ends of those time-units are arranged in such a way as to fall always on a Sunday. This implies that the feast terminating one *šabū‘ā* and that opening the next are celebrated on the same day: Pentecost (according to its name ‘the fiftieth’ day after Easter, i.e., the closing festival of the Easter pentecontad) coincides with the ‘first Sunday of the Apostles’ (i.e., the opening day of the ‘*šabū‘ā* of the Apostles’). In the same way the ‘Feast of the Twelve Apostles’ marks not only the end of the *šabū‘ā* bearing the same name but also the beginning of the pentecontad of ‘Summer’. As a consequence of this double-counting of the Sundays just mentioned, the Nestorian pentecontads actually last only forty-nine days, even though in theory they still comprise fifty full days. The double function of those Sundays indicates that the overlapping of the pentecontads was not a feature of the old calendar but was merely due to the desire not to interrupt the continuous sequence of the weeks, which is an essential trait of every Christian calendar.”

From this illuminating account of the calendar-year of the Nestorian Christian Church it is clear that its calendar represents a persistence in official Church practice of the ancient pentecontad calendar, with, however, a number of interesting and significant deviations from the

¹⁾ *Op. cit.*, 100-102. To the references bearing upon the Nestorian calendar there cited may be added MACLEAN, in HASTINGS, *ERE*, V, 771ab.

²⁾ Cf. BAUMSTARK, *Festbrevier und Kirchenjahr der syrischen Jakobiten*, 266-271.

original pattern. In it, unlike in the original pentecontad calendar, the week runs consecutively through the year. In fact the week seems to be the fundamental time-unit of this Nestorian calendar. In consequence each *šabû'a* consists, no longer of fifty days, as in the original pentecontad calendar, but of only forty-nine days, or seven complete weeks. But this is basically precisely the same system of time-reckoning as in the calendar of the Book of Jubilees. Whether the year of this Nestorian calendar consists of precisely fifty-two full weeks or three hundred and sixty-four days, our sources do not indicate, but in the light of the basic role which the week plays in this calendar, it seems not at all improbable that such is actually the case. But if so, this would then be a third fundamental principle in which this Nestorian calendar is in close agreement with the calendar of Jubilees.

As the LEWYS have pointed out so clearly, in this Nestorian calendar all the major festivals fall upon a Sunday. This is tantamount to saying that each major festival of this calendar falls upon the day which immediately follows the Sabbath, i.e. Saturday, the closing day of the week. Owing, however, to the urgent compulsion experienced by the framers of this calendar to make the week run consecutively through the year, this festival, falling upon the day after the Sabbath, i.e. upon a Sunday, the first day of the week, serves a double purpose, for it not only brings the one *šabû'â* to its formal close, just as did the *'ašeret* of the original pentecontad calendar, but it is also reckoned to the next *šabû'â* as its first day. Accordingly in this Nestorian calendar each *šabû'a*, commences, as has been noted, upon a Sunday. It is this double reckoning of this festival day, as the last day of the one *šabû'â* and the first day of the next *šabû'â*, which brings it about that in this calendar every *šabû'â* consists of only forty-nine days, and likewise that every *šabû'â* begins and ends with a festival. Moreover, it is this fact, that every *šabû'â* consists of only forty-nine days, with no festival day intervening between the one *šabû'â* and its successor, as was the case in the original pentecontad calendar, which makes it possible for the week to run consecutively through the entire year.

Furthermore a moment's thought must make clear that precisely some calendar such as this, a variant form of the ancient, pentecontad calendar, must have been basic to the time-reckoning of Holy Week in all the Gospel records, for in this assumption alone do we find an adequate explanation of the fact that Easter fell originally, and in the official calendar of the Christian Church must continue to fall

year by year, upon a Sunday, and with it the festival on the eighth day immediately preceding, Palm Sunday, likewise always upon a Sunday. In fact further thought must disclose that this very significant eight-days period, "Holy Week", as it is called, beginning upon a Sunday and ending upon a Sunday, upon "the day after the Sabbath", of the Gospel tradition, was identical in every essential detail with the *šapattum* of the *Maššôt* Festival plus the day of cutting the first sheaf of the new crop, the New Year's Day, of the ancient, pentecontad calendar. From this fact it may be inferred with a large measure of certainty that the pentecontad calendar was still employed, at least for the fixing of the time for celebrating their important folk-festivals, by the Galilean farmers of the time of Jesus in much the same manner as it is observed still today both by the peasantry of Palestine and by the Nestorian Church.

In one other significant respect also these Galilean farmers seem to have adhered stubbornly to an ancient Israelite system of time-reckoning, which had been discarded by so-called Normative Judaism apparently already at some moment in the final quarter of the fourth century B.C. ¹⁾ For the Synoptic Gospels and Acts, which, it may be said, in contrast to John, reflect the Galilean point of view and practice, still reckon the day from morning to morning, whereas John, conforming to the practice of Normative Judaism, reckons the day from evening to evening ²⁾.

Eusebius ³⁾, quoting Hegesippus, tells that the Galileans, like the Essenes, the Samaritans, the Sadducees and the Pharisees, constituted a distinct Jewish sect. Accordingly their peculiar calendar, employed by them, so it seems, in their own group religious practice, with its manifest dependence upon the ancient pentecontad calendar, must have been a distinctively Jewish sectarian institution. And inasmuch as these Galileans in their sectarian practice plainly reckoned the ancient Jewish *Maššôt* Festival according to the pentecontad ca-

¹⁾ Cf. MORGENSTERN, "Supplementary Studies in the Calendars of Ancient Israel", *HUCA* X (1935), 15-28; "The Chanukkah Festival and the Calendar of Ancient Israel", *HUCA* XX (1947), 34-40.

²⁾ MORGENSTERN, "The Reckoning of the Day in the Gospels and in Acts", *Crozer Quarterly*, XXXI (1949), 232-240. In this connection it should be noted that in Jubilees (cf. v 23; xxvii 19; xxxii 1, 30; xlix 1) the day is reckoned from evening to evening. In this, as well as in other essential respects (cf. below, note 2, p. 64), the system of time-reckoning of Jubilees diverges from that of the Galilean Jews and conforms to that of Normative Judaism.

³⁾ *Ecclesiastical History*, IV, 22.

lendar, though perhaps in a slightly modified form, as this was current within their group or sect, with the result that both the first and the eighth and final day of the eight days sacred period of the Festival fell upon the first day of the week, upon a Sunday, we can readily comprehend the bitter contention which arose in the early Christian Church with regard to the dating of the Passover, whether to follow the practice of Normative Judaism, which set the Passover upon the 14th day of the first month, regardless of the day of the week upon which this might fall, or to adhere to what we now see was the ancient Galilean, sectarian practice, based upon the Pentecontad calendar, of insisting that the festival must begin, and therefore likewise must end, upon a Sunday, the Lord's Day, viz. Palm Sunday and Easter Sunday ¹).

Moreover, inasmuch as in the festival calendar of these Galilean Jewish sectaries the eight-days sacred period of the *Maṣṣôt* Festival both began and ended upon a Sunday, it follows that, precisely as in the Nestorian calendar and likewise in the calendar of the Book of Jubilees, the *šabû'â*, corresponding to the "fifty" of the original pentecontad calendar, consisted actually of only forty-nine days.

According to Philo of Alexandria, the Therapeutae, a very small Jewish group or sect, of somewhat ascetic character, whose home was in Egypt, in the immediate vicinity of Alexandria, likewise used a religious calendar which represented a minor modification of the original pentecontad calendar. It too divided the year nominally into periods of fifty days each, but with each period consisting actually of only forty-nine days. The close of each period was marked by the observance of a festival ²). In these two essential details the calendar

¹) Eusebius, *op. cit.*, V, 23-24.

²) EPSTEIN, "Les fêtes des Therapeutes", *REJ*, 22 (1891), 20-50; MOFFATT, article "Therapeutae", in HASTINGS, *ERE*, XII, 315b-319a; LEWY, *op. cit.*, 97, note 392. In this connection it may be noted that 3 Macc. vi 38-40 speaks of a fifty-days period, extending from the 25th of Pachon to the 14th of Epiphi. During the first forty days of this period the Jews of Egypt were sentenced to be executed by Ptolemy Philopater. This sentence was to have been carried out during the next three days, Epiphi 5-7. But the Egyptian monarch relented and spared them. Accordingly they feasted during the next seven days, the last seven days of this fifty-days period. Regardless of the historical accuracy of the incident recorded, the passage suggests very strongly that not merely the Therapeutae but actually the entire Egyptian Jewish community were well acquainted with fifty-days periods which ended in festal celebration. This suggests further that certain practices of time-reckoning according to the principles of the pentecontad calendar lingered long among the Jews of Egypt in much the same manner as among their brethren in Palestine.

of the Therapeutae corresponded closely, or even exactly, to the calendars of the Galileans and the Nestorian Christians and also to that of the Book of Jubilees.

The Falashas too employ in their reckoning of the festivals and sacred days a calendar which plainly represents the persistence of the ancient pentecontad calendar, though with the customary modifications already noted ¹⁾. In this calendar the week is the fundamental institution, and as a consequence the weekly Sabbath becomes a day of paramount sanctity, so much so in fact that each Sabbath is given its distinctive name. Every seventh Sabbath, however, is regarded as possessing a measure of sanctity which transcends by far even that of the ordinary Sabbath. It is accordingly known as a "Sabbath of Mercy". Plainly then the Falasha calendar divides the year into seven periods of seven weeks each. Moreover, even though they employ the lunar calendar of Normative Judaism for ordinary time-reckoning, they reckon the Festival of Weeks in conformity with the procedure of the ancient pentecontad calendar, as the fiftieth day following the final day of the Passover Festival, rather than, as does Normative Judaism, as the fiftieth day after the opening day of the Festival. The result is that, whereas in Normative Judaism the Festival of Weeks falls upon the 6th of the third month, Sivan, in Falasha practice it falls upon the 12th of that month ²⁾. This follows the same principle, though it differs slightly in the outcome of its reckoning, as does the Book of Jubilees, which as we have already noted, sets the Festival of Weeks upon the 15th day of the third month.

Epiphanius speaks of a Jewish sect, whom he calls the Sebuacans, and whom he seems to coordinate in some respects with the Essenes. This name, Sebuacans, can be explained, as the LEWYS have pointed out ³⁾, only as based upon the term, *šabû'â*, the technical term employed by the Nestorian Christians for the period of seven weeks into which they divide the religious year. From this it would follow that these Sebuacans must have been acquainted with the *šabû'â*, and so in their religious practice must have employed a calendar very similar to, if not practically identical with, the calendar of the Nestorians, a modified form of the ancient pentecontad calendar, as we have seen.

But that even in the practice of Normative Judaism itself and in

¹⁾ A. EPSTEIN, *Eldad Hadani, seine Berichte über die X stämme und deren Ritus*, 161; RATHJENS, *Die Juden in Abessinien*, 75; LEWY, *op. cit.*, 113-122.

²⁾ EPSTEIN, *op. cit.*, 154; RATHJENS, *op. cit.*, 79; LEWY, *op. cit.*, 115-117.

³⁾ LEWY, *op. cit.*, 122.

the practice of groups or circles closely akin to it, despite the use of the lunar calendar from about 420 B.C. on as the approved and official system of time-reckoning ¹⁾, the influence of the ancient pentecontad calendar persisted in realistic and practical manner is a matter both illuminating and significant. In the first place, it should now be almost self-evident that the Biblical Festival of Firstfruits, or of Weeks, as, as we have learned, it eventually came to be called, celebrated upon the fiftieth day from "the morrow of the Sabbath" of the *Maṣṣôt* Festival ²⁾, is in itself a survival from the ancient, pentecontad calendar. This conclusion finds confirmation in the fact that in post-Biblical Jewish literature this festival is frequently called *ʿAṣeret*, or even by its Aramaic equivalent in the emphatic form, *ʿAṣarta*, "the Concluding Festival" ³⁾. Moreover, the Boethusians insisted that, in deviation from the practice of Normative Judaism, this festival must always be celebrated upon a Sunday ⁴⁾. In this respect their practice approximated closely that of the Nestorian Christians. Manifestly they interpreted the word Sabbath of the term used in the Biblical legislation for the festival, "the morrow of the Sabbath", as meaning specifically the seventh day of the week, Saturday. And actually, as we have seen, the seventh and final day of the *Maṣṣôt* Festival, as this was observed under the conditions of the pentecontad calendar, would have fallen upon the seventh day of the week.

Moreover, there is good reason for believing that the Rabbis too took cognisance of the folk-practice of dividing the year into periods of fifty days each, with each period closing with a festival called *ʿAṣeret*, for R. Joshua b. Levi, one of the most authoritative of the Amoraim of the third century, is reported to have said, "The *ʿAṣeret* of Sukkot should have come fifty days after the festival, just as the *ʿAṣeret* of Passover, i.e. the Shabuot Festival, comes fifty days after Passover. However, it is easy to make the pilgrimage ⁵⁾ in

¹⁾ "Supplementary Studies in the Calendars of Ancient Israel", *HUCA* X (1935), 108-148; "The Chanukkah Festival and the Calendar of Ancient Israel", *HUCA* XXI (1948), 457-470.

²⁾ Lev. xxiii 11, 15.

³⁾ Josephus, *Antiquities*, III, 10, 6; *Mishnah Rosh Hashanah*, I, 2; *Tal. bab. Rosh Hashanah*, 42; *Megillah*, 31b; *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer*, XLI (ed. FRIEDLANDER, 322).

⁴⁾ *Menahot*, 65a.

⁵⁾ The pilgrimage to Jerusalem for the observance of the festival and the offering at the Temple of the festival sacrifices; cf. Ex. xxiii 14-17; xxxiv 18, 22 f.; Lev. xxiii 10, 16 f., 40; Deut. xvi 5-7, 11, 14-16.

summer at Shabuot whereas in winter it would be difficult. Therefore God, in His mercy, appended the *'aseret* of Sukkot ¹⁾ immediately to that festival." ²⁾)

A midrash ³⁾ relates that R. Eliezer and Rabbi Joshua differed as to the exact date of creation. R. Eliezer maintained that the world was created in the month Tishri, while R. Joshua held that it was created in Nisan. The former held that Abel was born in Tishri at the time of the Sukkot Festival, i.e. shortly after creation, and lived only until the Chanukkah Festival, while the latter held that Abel was born in Nisan, at the time of the Passover Festival, and lived only until the *'aseret*, i.e. until the Festival of Weeks. Both agree, however, that the entire life-span of Abel was no more than fifty days. The dispute between these two eminent Rabbis, who functioned towards the end of the first century, implies quite plainly that in their minds, and consequently in popular practice also, fifty days constituted a commonly employed and convenient period of time-reckoning. And one further matter of significance is implicit in this record. R. Eliezer was certainly in error when he held, by implication at least, that only fifty days intervened between the Sukkot Festival, even counting from its closing day, and the Festival of Chanukkah. But it is clear at least that he held, as apparently did his colleague also, that every such fifty-days period of time-reckoning in the popular Jewish usage of their day must end with a solemn festival.

Perhaps even in Biblical usage some additional, though perhaps faint, traces of reckoning in fifty-day periods may still be discerned. Ex. xl 2, 17 states that the tabernacle in the wilderness was formally set up and dedicated by Moses upon the 1st of the first month. Num. x 11 states that the cloud rose from the tabernacle and the journey of the Israelites away from Sinai began upon the 20th of the second month. Counting thirty days to the month, this means that, according to the author of these two passages, a secondary Priestly writer, who lived and worked in all likelihood at some time within the fourth century B.C., the tabernacle remained stationary, with the cloud covering it and the "Radiance of Yahweh" ⁴⁾ dwelling

¹⁾ I.e. the eighth day of the Sukkot Festival, usually known as *Šemini 'aseret*; cf. Lev. xxiii 39; cf. MORGENSTERN, "Supplementary Studies in the Calendars of Ancient Israel", *HUCA* X (1935), 53-72.

²⁾ *Shir Hashirim Rabba*, 58b (ed. Wilna).

³⁾ *Beresbit Rabba*, 25d (ed. Wilna).

⁴⁾ For this rendering of the Hebrew term, *k'bod Yahweh*, usually translated mechanically, "the glory of the Lord", cf. Ezek. xliii 2; MORGENSTERN, "Psalm 48", *HUCA* XVI (1941), 66 ff., note 194.

within it, for exactly fifty days. Only when this initial time-unit in the existence of the tabernacle came to an end, impliedly therefore upon the day following the festal day which formally, in conformity with traditional practice, brought this fifty-day period to its close, was the tabernacle taken down in the prescribed manner and did the wandering of the Israelites through the desert begin.

Were it necessary the evidence of the not infrequent use of periods of fifty days as convenient units in the time-reckoning popularly employed by various groups and strata of the Jewish community of Palestine during the closing centuries of the pre-Christian and the first centuries of the present era might be extended even further ¹⁾. However, considerations of both time and space make this inadvisable here. The evidence presented up to this point suffices to establish this usage firmly. Nor can there be the slightest doubt that this folk-practice of reckoning time in units of fifty days represents a persistent survival of the system of time-reckoning basic to the ancient pentecontad calendar. We have seen, moreover, that certain distinct traces of this ancient calendar persist to the present day, and also that still today, just as during the centuries immediately preceding and following the birth of Christianity, these fifty-day time-units serve to determine the incidence of the important religious festivals of the year, whether in the calendar of the Galilean Jews, in that of the Nestorian Christians, or in that of the present-day peasantry of Palestine, both Christian and Moslem. We have seen further that all these different, sectarian calendars represent modifications of the original pentecontad calendar designed to adjust it to various relatively late developments, one of which was the institution of the week running consecutively and uninterruptedly through the course of an entire year. This brought it about that, at least in certain groups or sects, as we may perhaps now call them, the year was reckoned as of exactly fifty-two complete weeks or three hundred and sixty-four days, and that each period consisted, no longer of fifty, but only of forty-nine, days, or seven complete weeks. But most certainly this system of time-reckoning, this calendar, with its several minor, internal variations, is naught but a modified form of the ancient, pentecontad calendar, a distinctly sectarian calendar.

III. The Pentecontad Calendar and the Calendar of Jubilees

There can accordingly scarcely be any question that the calendar

¹⁾ For this cf. LEWY, *op. cit.*, 84 ff.

of Jubilees, and with it of course the calendar of 1 Enoch and likewise that of the Zadokite Fragments ¹⁾ is a direct outgrowth of the ancient, pentecontad calendar ²⁾. In all these calendars, just as in the pentecontad calendar, the number seven is basic. Time is measured by these calendars in units of seven days or one week, seven weeks or one *šabû'a*, seven years or one week of years, and seven weeks of years or one jubilee. In principle this is precisely the same theory of time-measurement as is fundamental to the ancient, pentecontad calendar. Furthermore, the bitter hostility to the lunar calendar as the official calendar of Judaism, particularly as an instrument for determining the incidence of the festivals, which had been official in Judaism since its inauguration as one important detail of the Priestly Reformation ³⁾, which finds vigorous expression in Jubilees ⁴⁾ and which seems to be implicit also in 1 Enoch, evidences that all three of these writings have distinctly sectarian character, are the work of Jewish sectaries who, precisely as did the Galilean Jews or the

¹⁾ Zadokite Fragments, 20.1.

²⁾ So already LEWY, *op. cit.*, 107-109.

³⁾ It is high time that it be realized by students of the Bible that the Priestly Code, and particularly its nucleus, Pg, was much more than a mere legal document and a literary stratum of the Hexateuch, that it was rather, so designed by its Priestly authors, the platform and program of a thorough-going and far-reaching reformation of Judaism and of its purging from all non-Yahwistic, and primarily solar, cultic beliefs, rites and institutions. This Priestly Reformation, the beginning of which, for cogent reasons, may be dated safely in the final quarter or the final third of the fifth century B.C., and which continued its activities for well over a century (cf. MORGENSTERN, "Supplementary Studies in the Calendars of Ancient Israel", *HUCA* X [1935], 72-148; "A Chapter in the History of the High-Priesthood", *AJSL*, LV [1938], 1-24, 183-197, 360-377; "Two Prophecies from the Fourth Century B.C. and the Evolution of Yom Kippur", *HUCA* XXIV [1952-1953], 1-74) brought into existence what that great and authoritative scholar, G. F. MOORE, has very aptly designated as Normative Judaism. This Normative Judaism naturally centered in the Temple and found its official exponents and champions in the priests of the Temple. Naturally, however, those Jews who dwelt at a distance from Jerusalem, upon the periphery of Jewish life, as it were, in Galilee, or in Alexandria, or in Dura-Europos for example, and so did not come under the immediate and constant influence of the Temple and its priesthood, and, moreover, many of whom, the Galileans for example, were farmers, resisted the Reformation to a greater or less degree and persisted in holding fast to ancient rites, institutions, and religious beliefs and practices, and among these, it is now becoming increasingly clear, the use of the ancient, pentecontad calendar. In this manner, as the natural, conservative reaction to the Priestly Reformation and resultant Normative Judaism, what might very properly be called Peripheral Judaism arose in varying forms and gradually evolved into sectarian Judaism of different types.

⁴⁾ Jub. i 15; vi 32-38; xxiii 19.

Nestorian Christians, stubbornly held fast to the ancient, pentecontad calendar, even though in a somewhat modified form, in resistance to the priestly regulated practice of official Judaism, and sought to fix the incidence of their Sabbaths and festivals by this calendar in the same manner as did their fathers before them. It would be a reasonably safe inference, in the light of the fundamentally agricultural character of the pentecontad calendar, that, just as with the Galilean Jews and the present-day peasantry of Palestine, the sectarian use of this calendar was rooted in the practice of the Jewish peasantry of Palestine, and in all likelihood principally in the peripheral, rural sections of the country, during the four or slightly more centuries which intervened between the Priestly Reformation of Judaism and the rise of Christianity.

Further and quite illuminating evidence of the fact that the calendar of Jubilees was the direct outgrowth of the ancient, pentecontad calendar may be seen in the striking role which the Festival of Firstfruits or of Weeks, for both of these Biblical names of the festival are used interchangeably in the Book of Jubilees, plays in the theory and in the practice of the sectarian Judaism which the book champions. This festival is beyond all doubt the most important religious occasion of its calendar year. Certainly it transcends all the other festivals both in religious significance and in historic connections. And indeed it is only natural that the Festival of Firstfruits should hold a primary position in the religious theory and practice of an essentially agricultural Jewish community. A far larger number of events in the traditional, early history of Israel are linked to this day than to any other festival, it was above all else the Festival of the Covenant; for not only did God reveal the Decalogue and establish His covenant with Israel at Sinai upon this day ¹⁾; but even long before this He established His covenant with Noah upon it and instituted this day as the supreme festival of the year ²⁾. Upon this same festal day God made, or better, for so the implication seems to be, renewed, His covenant with Abraham and his posterity ³⁾, and again upon this same day God renewed this covenant with Jacob ⁴⁾. Furthermore,

¹⁾ Jub. i 1. Moses ascends the mountain at God's bidding on III/16, the day following the revelation of the Decalogue. This must accordingly have transpired upon III/15.

²⁾ vi 1-21.

³⁾ xiv 10; xv 1 ff.

⁴⁾ xliv 3 f.

upon this same festal day Jacob entered into covenant with Laban and solemnized it by a covenant meal ¹⁾. Likewise upon this same day both Isaac ²⁾ and Judah ³⁾ were born, and also Abraham died during the night following immediately upon the festival, which he had piously observed in the prescribed manner ⁴⁾. Also, according to 2 Enoch lxviii 3, Enoch too was born upon this day. The outstanding significance of this festival in the calendar of Jubilees was no doubt heightened greatly by the essential role which the number fifty, in that it was the fiftieth day after "the morrow of the Sabbath of Passover", and the name, Feast of Weeks, played in connection with it.

The character of this Feast of Weeks as the supreme festival of the calendar of Jubilees is indicated by one further and very important consideration. Historically it was the very first of all the annual cycle of festivals of the Jewish calendar to be instituted. This was already in the time of Noah ⁵⁾, whereas Passover was inaugurated by Abraham on the occasion of the deliverance of Isaac from sacrifice ⁶⁾.

¹⁾ xxix 6 f.

²⁾ xvi 13. According to Rabbinic tradition Isaac was born on the first day of Passover; GINSBERG, *Legends of the Jews*, I, 261.

³⁾ xxviii 15.

⁴⁾ xxii 1-xxiii 1.

⁵⁾ vi 17-21.

⁶⁾ xvii 15; xviii 4, 18 f.; xlix 1-23. Actually there seems to be a duplication, and perhaps even a basic contradiction, between these two passages. xlviii 15-xlix 23 correlates the institution of Passover with the exodus from Egypt and gives no indication whatever that, as xvii 15; xviii 4, 18 f. state, the festival had been instituted already by Abram. Moreover, according to xlix 1-23 the festival was to be observed for seven days, beginning upon I/15. The data for the dating of the festival in xvii 15, xviii 4, 18 f. are much vaguer. The only precise date there given is in xvii 15. This passage relates that on I/12 Mastema, the spirit of evil, suggested to God that He test Abram's faith by commanding him to sacrifice Isaac. The only other time-data recorded in this narrative are that Abram rose early in the morning and, accompanied by Isaac and the two servants, set out upon his sad mission (xviii 3). On the third day they reached the place of sacrifice (xviii 4). Upon the seventh day they returned to Beersheba. Accordingly the festival was divinely ordained and was celebrated by Abram annually in order to fittingly commemorate the seven days of this fateful journey (xviii 17-19). Actually the festival is here called by neither name, *Pesah* or *Massôt*. But inasmuch as no other festival of seven days duration was celebrated in the first month, certainly no other festival was contemplated here. Moreover, there is good reason to believe that the ram offered by Abram was regarded as the substitute-sacrifice for the redemption of Isaac, his first-born son by Sarah, in precisely the same manner as the Paschal lamb was substituted for the first-born of every family of Israel in Egypt (Cf. also Ex. xxxiv 21a and MORGENSTERN, "The Oldest Document of the Hexateuch", *HUCA* IV [1927], 81-85). The passage can hardly have contemplated

Sukkot too was celebrated for the first time by Abraham, but only as a seven-days festival ¹⁾. Jacob was the first to make it a festival of eight days' duration ²⁾. The Day of Atonement was instituted also in the time of Jacob, to commemorate his grief when his sons sent to him the false message that Joseph had suffered a violent death ³⁾.

Moreover, the sanctity of the Festival of Weeks was of such absolute character, apparently transcending that of any of the other festivals, that it could be observed only upon a day which was inherently sacred. There is very good reason for believing that by a sacred day Sunday, and only Sunday, was meant. If this conclusion be correct, it would imply that the authors of Jubilees interpreted the Biblical term, "the morrow of the Sabbath", in precisely the role which it played in the original pentecontad calendar; for, as we have learned, under the conditions of this calendar the *Maṣṣôt* Festival was celebrated during the seven days' *ṣapattum* period, the week which ended with a Sabbath and which brought the old year to its solemn close. Accordingly the next day, "the morrow of the Sabbath", the day of the cutting of the first sheaf and likewise the New Year's Day, the day which inaugurated the "fifty" which culminated in the Festival of Firstfruits or Weeks, interpreted in terms of the calendar of Jubilees, with its week running consecutively through the year, would have been a Sunday. If the initial inference be correct, that according to Jubilees this festival might be celebrated only upon a Sunday, a sacred day, the seventh Sunday after the day of cutting the first sheaf of the new grain, we have here another, and an illuminating instance of the close and purposed adherence of the calendar of Jubilees to the ancient, pentecontad calendar, in principle at least.

But just here a glaring and significant inconsistency in the calculation of the Book of Jubilees is revealed. As has been indicated, Jubilees repeatedly gives the date of the Festival of Firstfruits or of Weeks as III/15 and that of the *Pesaḥ-Maṣṣôt* Festival as I/15-21. Now if, in accordance with the ancient practice of the pentecontad calendar and likewise conforming to the Biblical prescription, the Festival of Weeks fell upon the fiftieth day after "the morrow of the Sabbath", i.e. after the closing day of the *Pesaḥ-Maṣṣôt* Festival, in

a date for the Passover Festival other than I/15-21 precisely as in xlix 1 ff. It seems to imply then that three days intervened between Mastema's suggestion to God and Abram's actually setting out upon his journey.

¹⁾ xvi 16-31.

²⁾ xxxii 27-29.

³⁾ xxxiv 12, 18 f.; cf. v 17 f.

other words fifty days after I/21, it should have been celebrated, not at all upon III/15, but instead upon III/10. These two dates can not be reconciled in any way. The only possible explanation of this manifest departure of the calendar of Jubilees from the ancient, pentecontad calendar can be that, in conformity with what the authors of the Book of Jubilees or the formulators of its calendar plainly regarded as a basic and compelling principle, viz. that the Festival of Firstfruits or Weeks must fall upon a Sunday, they disregarded the other principle, that it must come upon the fiftieth day after the closing day of the *Pesah-Maṣṣôt* Festival. In other words, they sacrificed one basic principle of the ancient, pentecontad calendar in order to adhere to another.

But in the original pentecontad calendar both of these principles must have been enforceable simultaneously and automatically. This was easily possible under the reckoning of the original pentecontad calendar in time-units of fifty days each. Not until this system was superseded by that of reckoning time by months of thirty days each, a unit utterly foreign to the pentecontad calendar, as has been said, did the confusion and inconsistency which we have noted in the calendar of Jubilees arise. Under the terms of this calendar, and with the *Pesah-Maṣṣôt* Festival falling upon I/15-21, the Festival of Weeks could no longer fall upon the fiftieth day after the close of the earlier festival and with this upon a Sunday also. Plainly the formulators of the calendar of Jubilees had to choose between two no longer harmonizable principles. And they chose to conform to that principle which, manifestly, they regarded as the more vital, and accordingly to disregard the other principle completely. Therefore they persisted in celebrating the Feast of Weeks upon a Sunday and even in retaining the name, Feast of Weeks, for the festival, even though in their calendar it no longer marked the completion of a specific seven-weeks period, but instead fell upon the fifty-fifth day after the closing day of the *Pesah-Maṣṣôt* Festival.

At this point we are in position to reconstruct in tabular form the calendar of Jubilees clearly and precisely. Our starting-point was that in it the Festival of Firstfruits or of Weeks fell upon III/15, which is a Sunday. A consideration of equal importance is the fact, which we have established, that the calendar of Jubilees, like that of 1 Enoch, divided the year into four quarters, each consisting of ninety-one

¹) vi 37.

days, or thirteen weeks, or three months. But, unlike the calendar of 1 Enoch, in the calendar of Jubilees the first month in each quarter consisted of thirty-one days and the second and third months each of thirty days. This yields the following annual calendar of days, weeks and months, arranged according to the quarters of the year; for, as we have learned, all four quarters of the year were identical in all respects.

I IV VII X				II V VIII XI				III VI IX XII					
1	8	15	22	29	5	12	19	26	3	10	17	24	Tuesday
2	9	16	23	30	6	13	20	27	4	11	18	25	Wednesday
3	10	17	24	31	7	14	21	28	5	12	19	26	Thursday
4	11	18	25	1	8	15	22	29	6	13	20	27	Friday
5	12	19	26	2	9	16	23	30	7	14	21	28	Saturday
6	13	20	27	3	10	17	24	1	8	15	22	29	Sunday
7	14	21	28	4	11	18	25	2	9	16	23	30	Monday

A careful comparison of this reconstruction of the calendar of Jubilees with that of Mlle. JAUBERT ¹⁾ will show that they agree in every single detail except one, one which, however, is not really vital. Inasmuch as she makes months III, VI, IX and XII consist of thirty-one days each and the other eight months of thirty days each, whereas I make months I, IV, VII and X consist of thirty-one days each and the eight other months of thirty days each, it follows that, while in her calendar-table I/1, IV/1, VII/1 and X/1 fall upon a Wednesday, in mine these days fall upon a Tuesday. In both calendar-tables months II, III, V, VI, VIII, IX, XI and XII are in complete agreement, except that, as has been said, in her calendar-table III/31, VI/31, IX/31 and XII/31 fall upon a Tuesday. But inasmuch as these days are the same respectively as I/1, IV/1, VII/1 and X/1 in my calendar-table, and since in both tables this day falls upon a Tuesday, it follows that both reconstructions of the calendar are in complete practical agreement. Actually her tabular reconstruction of the calendar represents the form it should have according to the data recorded in 1 Enoch, while my reconstruction reflects the data recorded in Jubilees. The

¹⁾ *Op. cit.*, 253.

very fact that, setting out from two altogether different starting-points, we reached what are really identical conclusions argues very strongly for the validity of our initial assumptions, of our techniques, and of the basically joint conclusion which we have reached.

IV. The Sectarian Character of the Calendar of Jubilees

From all this evidence it should now be perfectly clear that the calendar of the Book of Jubilees was essentially the ancient, pentecontad calendar, still current, although with certain important modifications, within some specific, sectarian group or groups, the majority of whose members were in all likelihood farmers. Its major modification of the original pentecontad calendar resulted from the principle which it employed, of making the week run consecutively through the year. As a result its *šabû'â* consisted of only forty-nine days, whereas the corresponding time-unit of the original pentecontad calendar consisted of fifty days. Correspondingly its jubilee extended over only forty-nine years, whereas the jubilee of the original pentecontad calendar embraced fifty years. Very interestingly and consistently, it makes exactly forty-nine jubilees plus nine years intervene between the creation of the world and the revelation upon Sinai. And when to this forty more years are added, the forty years of Israel's wandering through the desert, so it goes on to explain, exactly fifty jubilees, each of forty-nine years, elapsed in world history between creation and Israel's entrance into Palestine ¹).

A second significant modification of, or even purposed departure from, the original pentecontad calendar manifest in the calendar of Jubilees is its use of the month of thirty days as a basic unit in its system of time-reckoning, and particularly in its dating of the festivals. As we have learned, the month, whether the solar month of thirty days or the lunar month of twenty-nine days, was an institution which had no place whatever in the original pentecontad calendar. And inasmuch as Jubilees sanctions only the solar month of thirty days and, by clear implication, forbids absolutely the use of the lunar

¹) 1 4. This reckoning, when coupled with the fact that the Book of Jubilees is, and undoubtedly with conscious purpose, divided into fifty chapters, indicates quite clearly that its authors were well acquainted with the basic significance of the number fifty. And inasmuch as this numeral served as a basic unit of numbering and counting only in the pentecontad calendar, at least so far as we know, we have here additional evidence in support of our general thesis that the calendar of Jubilees evolved out of the ancient, pentecontad calendar.

month of twenty-nine days, it follows that this thirty-days month of Jubilees must have been borrowed from some solar calendar. What calendar that may have been we shall learn in due time ¹⁾. As we have seen, the use of the thirty-days month in the calendar of Jubilees gives rise to a certain measure of confusion and necessitates a complete disregard of some of the fundamental principles of the original pentacontad calendar, as these are recorded in Biblical legislation.

One further question, one of interest and importance, raised by Mlle. JAUBERT, may now be considered. Was this calendar of Jubilees realistic and practicable; was it actually used by those Jewish secretaries who recorded it in their writings, or was it only theoretical? One thing is certain, viz. that the calendar as set forth in Jubilees reveals a number of significant inconsistencies and even contradictions, both of fact and of principle. One of these we have already noted. Two others may be cited here. No doubt a careful, analytic study would disclose numerous others of equal or perhaps of even greater significance.

Jub. vi 1-26 says explicitly that Noah came forth from the ark upon III/1, that upon this same day he built an altar and offered sacrifice thereon, and that in response thereto, and therefore upon this very same day, God made a covenant with him and his posterity forever, and He likewise commanded that that day, which until this moment had been observed in heaven as a festival, should henceforth be so observed also upon earth, as the Festival of Firstfruits or of Weeks. But elsewhere and repeatedly Jubilees sets this festival, not upon III/1, but, as has been noted, upon III/15 ²⁾.

Jub. v 23 records that the flood began upon II/17. According to v 27 the water prevailed over the earth for five months or one hundred and fifty days. It is true that the normal month of the calendar of Jubilees consisted of thirty days. But the first, fourth, seventh and tenth months thereof consisted of thirty-one days ³⁾. Accordingly

¹⁾ Below, p. 67.

²⁾ xv 1; xvi 13; xlv 3 ff.

³⁾ v 29 f.; vi 23. These four extra days, one in each of these four months, are of course the four epagomenal days, which, added to three hundred and sixty days, i.e. to twelve months of thirty days each, make the year of Jubilees consist of three hundred and sixty-four days, or fifty-two complete weeks. The addition of these four days to three hundred and sixty days of twelve normal months, and with three months intervening between each such additional day, is the medium which makes the week run consecutively through the entire year. These four days,

five months, reckoning from II/27 onward, would consist, not of one hundred and fifty, but rather of one hundred and fifty-two days. Undoubtedly in these data the author of Jubilees is merely repeating what he found in the Biblical record. However, had his calendar been for him an instrument of actual, daily use, he would certainly not

as has been said, all exactly three months apart, mark the beginnings of the seasons and are to be celebrated as days of memorial, and therefore as festivals. As has been indicated, the calendar of 1 Enoch employs this same system, with, however, one seeming, minor deviation. Whereas in Jubilees these four extra days are reckoned as the first day of months I, IV, VII, and X, in 1 Enoch lxxii 9,34 these four extra days seem to be added to months III, VI, IX and XII, to be reckoned as the final day of each of these months, and so to make each of these four months consist of thirty-one days. (But cf. the exceedingly vague and confusing statement of lxxxii 11.) Furthermore, the arrangement of 1 Enoch would make XII/31, one of these four added days, the final day of the old year, whereas the arrangement of Jubilees would make this very same day I/1, the first day of the new year. 1 Enoch lxxxii 15 ff. establishes definitively that its calendar year began at the commencement of spring, and it is a safe presumption that this was true of the calendar year of Jubilees also. Accordingly I/1 was probably recognized in the calendar of Jubilees, just as was its antecedent, the day of cutting the first sheaf, in the ancient, pentecontad calendar, as the New Year's Day. However, it is a matter of more than passing significance that nowhere does Jubilees apply this title to its I/1, nor in fact does it ever use this title or designate any specific day as the New Year's Day. There must have been some cogent reason for the complete silence of Jubilees with regard to the New Year's Day, though what it may have been lack of evidence does not permit us to determine. However, it may be noted here that what is unquestionably a very late stratum of the Priestly Code of the Hexateuch seems to set the New Year's Day upon I/1 instead of upon VII/1; cf. Ex. xii 1; xl 2; Lev. xxiii 20-22; MORGENSTERN, "The Three Calendars of Ancient Israel", *HUCA* I (1924), 49; "Supplementary Studies in the Three Calendars of Ancient Israel", *HUCA* X (1935), 81-90.

Likewise Ezra vi 15, a passage the relative lateness of the literary composition of which is attested by its use of the Babylonian month-name, Adar, and this too used by itself and without defining it in the customary manner as the twelfth month, according to the older custom of designating the months by number (cf. MORGENSTERN, "The New Year for Kings", *Gaster Anniversary Volume*, 439-456), undoubtedly employed a calendar which set the New Year's Day upon I/1. For certainly for the 3rd of Adar here, a day without any significance whatsoever, we should read, with 1 Esdras vii 5 and likewise with *Midrash Bammidbar rabba* xii 18; xiii 2 (ed. Wilna), the 23rd. This would imply that the rejoicing of the Jewish community of Palestine and its celebration of the dedication of the Temple, rebuilt during the reign, and with the permission and support, of Darius, the Persian king, began upon the 23rd of Adar, continued for the traditional seven festal days, Adar 23-29, the last seven days of the month and likewise the last seven days of the year, and reached its climax upon the eighth day, the 1st of Nisan, corresponding to I/1 of the older system of designating the months by number. Plainly the pattern for this dating of the Temple dedication was the account of the dedication of the tabernacle in the wilderness of Ex. xl 1 ff. Beyond all question a Jewish sectarian system of calculation which set the New Year's Day upon I/1 is reflected in both Ex. xl and Ezra vi 13-22.

have said that this five months period covered exactly one hundred and fifty days.

All this evidence, and, as has been said, it could no doubt be multiplied extensively ¹⁾ were it necessary and did time and space permit, suggests very strongly that this calendar of Jubilees was not at all a realistic and practicable calendar, employed by the Jewish sect in question for all matters which involved time-reckoning. It is almost self-evident that in practically all affairs of conventional, daily life, and particularly in their contacts with their neighbors who adhered to and employed the calendar of Normative Judaism, and likewise in their dealings with both the government and the Temple authorities, these Jewish sectaries had to conform to the established and official lunar calendar. Only in their sectarian practice, as this concerned their religion and its institutions, and particularly its sacred days, the Sabbaths, the festivals, the years, and the larger year-units, did they employ, and that no doubt only as best they could with the many restrictions which their Jewish environment imposed upon them, their own peculiar calendar. In this respect their situation and its attendant procedure must have been strikingly similar to that of the present-day peasantry of Palestine, who in the affairs of routine, daily existence conform to either of the two calendars current in Palestinian life, the Julian or the Moslem, but in the dating and celebration of their festivals continue to employ the ancient pentecontad calendar. In quite the same way Jesus and his disciples came up to Jerusalem to observe the Passover in the manner traditional with them, from Sunday through Sunday, in conformity with the principles of their Galilean, sectarian religious calendar, a calendar which, it becomes increasingly clear, must have had striking affinities with the calendar of Jubilees ²⁾. In quite the same manner this parti-

¹⁾ Cf. the matter discussed in n. 6 on p. 57; also MORGENSTERN, "Additional Notes on the Calendars of Ancient Israel", *HUCA* III (1926), 87-100.

²⁾ However, one significant and illuminating difference between the sectarian practice of the Galilean Jews and that recorded in Jub. may be noted. According to the Synoptic Gospels Jesus and his disciples sacrificed the Paschal lamb and ate their Paschal meal, i.e. the Seder of traditional Judaism, upon Thursday night of Holy Week, whereas, as John states specifically, for the followers of Normative Judaism the Passover did not begin and the Paschal lamb was not sacrificed and eaten until Friday eve, i.e. one day later. Of the reason for and the import of this divergence in the dating of the Passover in the practice of these Galilean Jews from that of Normative Judaism we need say no more here than that it grew out of their adherence to the ancient system of reckoning the day, viz. from morning to morning. But this much is clear, that Jesus and his disciples could

cular group of Jewish sectaries must have sought to adhere strictly to their peculiar, religious calendar. But in so doing they must have been hemmed in and restricted in no small measure by their relations with their neighbors, the adherents of Normative Judaism. The result was undoubtedly that they had to constantly adjust their religious life, and their calendar with it, to the life and the calendar of the Jewish world which surrounded them. In most matters of daily existence they had to think in terms of this outside world. Small wonder therefore that even in the recording of the conditions and traditions of their sectarian calendar occasional confusions and contradictions should have crept in.

Such then must the Book of Jubilees and the calendar which it records have been, both of definitely Jewish sectarian character. Precisely what Jewish sect this may have been and also what possible connections it may have had with the Jewish sect or sects whose writings are steadily coming to light as the literary and cultural treasures of the Qumran caves are being recovered, is a problem in itself, which however, need not be considered here.

V. The History of the Pentecontad Calendar in Palestine

Finally, additional light may well be shed upon this interesting matter of the persistence of the use of the pentecontad calendar, even though in slightly varying forms, by Jewish groups or sects, recruited largely, so it seems, from the peasant stratum of society, primarily for the determination of the precise dates of their festivals, by a brief consideration of the history of this calendar in Jewish circles.

not have sacrificed their Paschal lamb in the Temple and with the cooperation of the priests there, as is enjoined in Deut. xvi 2, 5-7 and as was the practice of Normative Judaism (*Mishnah Pesahim* V 5-10). Instead they must have slaughtered it themselves at or near the place where they ate it, in accordance with the secondary Priestly legislation in Ex. xii 1-11. That, despite its incorporation into the Torah, this P legislation in Ex. xii is late and of distinctly sectarian character, completely at variance with the official practice of Normative Judaism as recorded in Num. xxviii 16-25, and that it is a unit of literary composition and of sectarian practice with those secondary passages of the Priestly Code which would set the New Year's Day upon 1/1 (cf. n. 3 on p. 62), I hope to be able to demonstrate convincingly upon some other occasion. But in respect to the sacrifice of the Paschal lamb the procedure outlined in Jub. xlix 1 f., 16-22 is basically that recorded in Deut. xvi 2, 5-7 and Num. xxviii 16-25. In at least this one very important respect the practice of the Galilean Jews differed from that which Jubilees enjoins upon its sectarian followers.

As has been said, the pentecontad calendar was of Amorite or Canaanite origin. The frequent use of the number seven and also of seventy and likewise the fact that time-units of seven days and seven years are mentioned with relative frequency in its literature suggest very strongly that, just as might have been expected, this calendar was employed in the Canaanite city-state of Ugarit in the fifteenth century B.C.. The Israelites adopted it when, emerging from the desert, they established themselves in Canaan and gradually turned to agriculture as their dominant occupation, particularly in that more fertile portion of the land which later became the Northern Kingdom. This calendar continued in vogue in Israel until the erection of the Temple in Jerusalem by Solomon.

As has been said, this pentecontad calendar was essentially an agricultural calendar, based primarily upon the state of the crops. It is a well established fact, however, that in different localities in Palestine, localities even quite close to each other, the state of the crops may vary to a marked degree, largely because of the mountainous terrain and resultant climatic differences. Crops may ripen and become ready for harvesting in some low-lying sections of the country as much as two weeks earlier than in other, near-by sections lying at a higher elevation. The natural effect of this circumstance was that the local calendars of these various sections of the country must have diverged from each other in corresponding measure. Accordingly each small section of the country must have had its own local form of the pentecontad calendar. This was a matter of little significance so long as the country was divided into separate city-states of relatively small extent, each constituting an independent political unit, as it was during the entire, pre-Israelite, Canaanite period, or even into correspondingly small tribal districts, as it seems to have been during the pre-Davidic portion of Israel's sojourn in the land. But the moment David brought the United Kingdom into being the inadequacy of the pentecontad calendar in the life of a people organized politically as a nation, and still more so as an empire, must have become apparent. Royal decrees, controlling the administration of the kingdom or empire in all its provinces, and the reports of the royal administrators to the king and his directives to them had to be dated, and this of course by a system of time-reckoning and dating which would be uniform and valid throughout the entire kingdom or empire. Quite naturally time was needed for this fact to become clearly understood. But it was inevitable that

eventually a new calendar would have to supplant in Israel the old and now inadequate, pentecontad calendar.

But the adoption of a new calendar implies much more than a change in the system of time-reckoning. A calendar is primarily a religious institution. It is a basic factor in the cult-system of any religion that, above all else, it determines the proper time for the observance of festivals. Not at all surprisingly, the inadequacy of the pentecontad calendar had, so it seems, been realized in Tyre even before it was perceived in Israel. Apparently already under Abibaal, the father of Hiram, King of Tyre, that city had begun to develop its vast commercial empire, which before long embraced the entire Mediterranean world and reached out to the countries bordering upon the Atlantic Ocean. Commercial relations of steadily growing range and complexity were inaugurated with the peoples of these various lands. Tyrian colonies were founded at favorable sites. For the maintenance of these commercial relations and of this vast, Tyrian, commercial empire a calendar of more universal scope than the old, pentecontad calendar was absolutely indispensable.

Again, and quite naturally, it needed time for this situation to be properly comprehended and effectively met. Finally, however, under Hiram, quite early in the tenth century B.C., the situation became acute. Hiram inaugurated a far-reaching religious reformation in his land and throughout his empire. The old, native, agricultural religion of the Tyrians was transformed into a solar religion. As the concrete expression thereof the former, major agricultural deities were now expanded into solar deities, to whom quite naturally Hiram erected new and magnificent temples ¹⁾. These new temples were of course the symbols of the change in the religious outlook and practice which had thus come about. And of course hand in hand with this transformation of the official state-religion of Tyre went the substitution of a new, distinctly solar calendar for the former pentecontad calendar, a solar calendar consisting of twelve months of thirty days each plus five or, at proper intervals, six additional days, days which stood apparently outside the reckoning of the months, were inserted into the year, in all likelihood, at its very close, and possessed festal character. Just how, in connection with this calendar, the two equinoctial days were determined with

¹⁾ Josephus, *Antiquities*, VIII, 5, 3; *contra Apionem*, I, 17, 18

precision is a matter of much interest, into which, however, considerations of space forbid us to enter here.

Beginning already under David, during the closing years of his reign, and continuing and expanding throughout the long reign of his son, Solomon, the relations, political, cultural and religious, between Israel and Tyre grew closer and more effective. Commerce between Tyre and Israel increased steadily in character and volume. Commercial relations with other peoples were likewise inaugurated and expanded rapidly ¹). A new calendar was now imperative for Israel, as it had been for Tyre; and Tyre offered the pattern of what that new calendar should be. But for Israel too, just as for Tyre, the calendar was a fundamental institution of the state-religion; consequently the adoption of a new calendar involved a far-reaching transformation of the religion.

Solomon borrowed the Phoenician solar calendar and made it the official calendar throughout his empire ²). And as the inevitable accompaniment of this, he transformed the official religion of Israel from its former, partly pastoral and partly, and even predominantly, agricultural character into a, superficially at least, solar religion. Yahweh, the ancient, pastoral god of Israel, whose original home was in the desert, and who had during the first centuries of Israel's settlement in Palestine been in preponderant measure transformed into a characteristically agricultural deity, now came to be conceived of as, and to be invested with the attributes and powers of, a distinctly solar deity, as the sun-god, the god, not so much of the sun in his daily course through the heaven but rather of the sun in his annual course through the days, the seasons and the years. And as the symbol of this transformation of Yahweh into a predominantly solar deity, Solomon, following closely the example of his ally and, in this matter, his guide, Hiram, erected a new sanctuary to this new Yahweh. This new sanctuary, the Temple in Jerusalem, was built directly after the pattern of the Phoenician temple of Melcarth, which Hiram had erected but a few years earlier. It was designed by Phoe-

¹) MORGENSTERN, "Amos Studies, III", *HUCA* XV (1940), 59-81; "Amos Studies", I, 183-205; ALBRIGHT, "The Biblical Period", in *The Jews, Their History, Culture, and Religion*, ed. FINKELSTEIN, 27 f.

²) MORGENSTERN, "The Three Calendars of Ancient Israel", *HUCA* I (1924), 64-71; "Amos Studies, II", *HUCA* XII-XIII (1937-1938), 20-34; "Amos Studies, I", 146-160; "The Chanukkah Festival and the Calendar of Ancient Israel", *HUCA* XXI (1948), 374-401.

Phoenician architects, was built by Phoenician workmen, and very largely out of materials imported from Phoenicia for this purpose ¹⁾. And, like the temple of Melcarth at Tyre, it too was erected upon an elevated place, upon the Temple Mount, and was so oriented that upon the two annual equinoctial days the first rays of the rising sun shone in through the eastern gate of the Temple, kept tightly closed through all the remainder of the year, but opened just before dawn of the day of the autumnal equinox for this particular, momentous occasion in the life of the annual sun ²⁾. These rays kindled the sacred fire upon the altar in the courtyard, just in front of the main entrance into the sanctuary, and then, pushing onward through this doorway, illumined the darkness of the sanctuary within. This ceremony was called "the coming of the radiance of Yahweh" ³⁾. Its celebration upon the morning of the day of the fall equinox marked the beginning of the new year according to this solar calendar of Solomon. Inaugurated by this great king, and that too for manifestly compelling reasons, this solar calendar, which plainly centered in the Jerusalem Temple, remained the official calendar of the Southern Kingdom, with, however, two probable, brief interludes, throughout its entire existence as a nation.

As can be readily understood, this transformation of the religion of Israel and the new, solar calendar met with varying receptions by the different strata of Israelite society. Quite naturally the court party, the growing merchant class, and the steadily expanding urban population, and particularly that of Jerusalem, the capital city, welcomed this change and the various institutions which it created with complete satisfaction, for, subconsciously at least, they must have sensed that the same circumstances of cultural evolution, which had necessitated this transformation, had likewise called into being the reorganization of Israelite society which had singled them out as a distinct and, at least in their own thinking, the superior and privileged, stratum of society. On the other hand, the rural sections of the country, the farmers of the North and the shepherds of the South, conservative and reactionary by nature and also by tradition, must have viewed this transformation, both of religion and of society, with distrust and antagonism. The new, solar calendar, so different from

¹⁾ 1 Ki. v 15-25; vi 1-7, 46.

²⁾ MORGENSTERN, "The Gates of Righteousness", *HUCA* VI (1929), 1-37.

³⁾ MORGENSTERN, "Biblical Theophanies", *ZA* XXV (1911), 141-153; XXVIII (1913), 36-60.

the pentecontad calendar which they had inherited from their fathers, and which was in many respects the concrete symbol of this far-reaching transformation, must have been particularly repugnant to them.

The North especially, the loyalty of whose people to the Davidic dynasty had from the very beginning been decidedly uncertain¹), could not regard the new calendar otherwise than with extreme disfavor. Small wonder then that when, following the division of the Kingdom in 931 B.C., Jerobeam became the ruler of the Northern Kingdom, one of his first official acts was the establishment of the sanctuaries at Dan and Bethel as the official, national shrines of his kingdom. The bull-images of Yahweh in these sanctuaries, the traditional manner of representation of the supreme deity of the ancient, pre-solar, agricultural religion of the Semitic peoples of Western Asia²), indicate that what Jerobeam did was to revive the former, agricultural, Canaanite religion of the early Israelites. And with this, of course, he reinstituted the ancient, agricultural, pentecontad calendar³). This is evidenced by the fact that, whereas in Judah, the Southern Kingdom, the years of the reigns of the kings were reckoned from a New Year's Day celebrated upon the day of the autumnal equinox, in the Northern Kingdom they were reckoned from a New Year's Day early in the spring. This could have been only the New Year's Day of the pentecontad calendar, the day of cutting the first sheaf of the new crop. With the exception of the relatively brief period during which Ahab and Ahaziah, his son, sat upon the throne, when the religious and cultural influence of Tyre, stimulated by Jezebel, was dominant, and in consequence the Tyrian, solar calendar received the royal sanction and came into at least limited use once again, the pentecontad calendar continued to be employed as the official calendar of the predominantly agricultural Northern Kingdom during the entire period of its existence as a nation. And, as might well be expected, long after the Northern Kingdom had come to its end, the pentecontad calendar lived on persistently among the farmers of the North, the Samaritans and the

¹) Cf. 2 Sam. xv 1-6; xix 9-13, 41-44; 1 Ki. xii 16.

²) Cf. the constant designation in Ugaritic literature of El, the supreme deity of the Ugaritic pantheon, as *Tôr*, "Bull"; also MEEK, *Hebrew Origins*, 133 ff.; 158 ff.

³) MORGENSTERN, "The Chanukkah Festival and the Calendar of Ancient Israel", *HUCA* XXI (1948), 481-486.

Galileans, down even to the present day, and was employed by them particularly to determine the proper days for the celebration of their traditional and beloved, agricultural festivals.

In the Southern Kingdom, however, the solar calendar inaugurated by Solomon persisted in use as the official system of time-reckoning until the very end of its national existence, with possibly two interruptions, one of them relatively brief. There is reason to believe that, following the defeat of Amaziah of Judah by Joash of Israel in the second decade of the eighth century B.C., the Southern Kingdom was reduced to a state bordering upon vassalage to its Northern conqueror. Apparently one of the conditions imposed upon the Southern Kingdom was the adoption of the pentacontad calendar as replacement for the solar calendar ¹). If so, then the narrative in 2 Ki. xvi 10-16 can probably be explained best as the record of Ahaz' restoration of the original solar cult of the Temple, and especially of the rite of "the coming of the radiance of Yahweh" upon the morning of the equinoctial New Year's Day, and with this the revival of the solar calendar as the official system of time-reckoning of the Southern Kingdom.

The other, a relatively brief, period of the interruption in the use of the solar calendar in the Southern Kingdom was during the final thirteen years of the reign of Josiah, when, by royal decree, the Deuteronomic legislation, with its unique calendar, was in effect. In large measure the Deuteronomic Reformation represented an earnest attempt, instigated by unknown, contemporary prophets, to eradicate all expressions of non-Yahwistic, and particularly solar, religion from the official, religious practice of Judah and to restore what they regarded as the old and true worship of Yahweh, rooted in desert, nomadic belief and custom. One of the practical procedures of this Reformation was the abolition of the solar calendar and the adoption in its stead of a new calendar, which seems to have been, however, in all essential respects except one, but one of great importance, naught but the ancient, pentacontad calendar. These prophetic reformers revived the *Pesah*, a festival undoubtedly of desert origin ²), which the invading Israelites had brought with them into Palestine, but which in its new, agricultural, and eventually commercial, environment had for several centuries been falling into

¹) VOGELSTEIN, *Jerobeam II*, 8 ff.; cf. MORGENSTERN, *op. cit.* 420-427.

²) WELLHAUSEN, *Reste arabischen Heidentums*¹, 98 f.; cf. Ex. vii 16; viii 23 f.

ever increasing disuse¹⁾, and made it the major festival in their reorganized calendar. They set it, seemingly in conformity with ancient tradition, upon the night of the new moon immediately preceding the vernal equinox. And to heighten its importance they shifted the agricultural *Maššôt* Festival from the time when it had been observed originally, under the conditions of the pentecontad calendar, i.e. from the seven days *šapattum* period immediately following the seventh "fifty" and immediately preceding the day of the cutting of the first sheaf, and made it the adjunct of the *Pesaḥ* in that its celebration began upon the morning following immediately upon the night of the *Pesaḥ* observance and continued for seven days²⁾. Naturally this shift severed completely the original and basic connection of the *Maššôt* Festival with the state of the crop, and especially with the ceremonial act of the cutting of the first sheaf of the new grain. Ever thereafter, in all succeeding reorganizations of the Jewish calendar the *Pesaḥ* and *Maššôt* Festivals remained closely integrated as one single festival.

The two other major festivals of the pentecontad calendar, at least as it had been observed in Israel from earliest times, the Festival of Firstfruits and the Festival of Ingathering, were accorded a place of dignity in the Deuteronomic calendar³⁾. The names of the two festivals were changed, that of the former to *Šabu'ôt*, "Weeks", and that of the latter to *Sukkôt*, "Tabernacles". *Šabu'ôt* continued to be celebrated as it had been from ancient times, seven weeks after the day of "putting the sickle to the standing grain"⁴⁾; hence the new name of the festival. And *Sukkôt*, there is good reason to believe, was restored to that moment of the year in which it had been celebrated of old under the conditions of the pentecontad calendar, the seven days *šapattum* period at the end of the fourth "fifty"⁵⁾.

But with the death of Josiah in 608 B.C. and the eventual accession of Jehoiakim to the throne the Deuteronomic Reformation was repudiated and the old, traditional, solar cult of the Temple was revived. This is established convincingly by Ezek. viii 16, for the scene there depicted is that of the greeting of "the coming of the

¹⁾ MORGENSTERN, "The Oldest Document of the Hexateuch", *HUCA* IV (1927), 66-69.

²⁾ Deut. xvi 1-8.

³⁾ Deut. xvi 9-17.

⁴⁾ V. 9.

⁵⁾ V. 13.

radiance of Yahweh" into the Temple through the open eastern gate upon the morning of the equinoctial New Year's Day of the solar calendar ¹⁾).

The intimate relationship between the Temple and the solar calendar, both instituted by Solomon, is now readily apparent. It was this all-important rite of "the coming of the radiance of Yahweh", the first rays of the rising sun upon the morning of the day of the autumnal equinox, which marked the beginning of the year of this solar calendar and therefore controlled its system of time-reckoning. Without the Temple this ceremony could not be performed; and without this ceremony to determine its New Year's Day the solar calendar could not be controlled. Accordingly it is not at all surprising that with the destruction of the Temple by the Babylonians, following their capture of Jerusalem in 586 B.C., the solar calendar should have fallen completely into disuse. Moreover, after the carrying away to Babylon of the successive captivities, recruited almost entirely from the urban population ²⁾, and the destruction of Jerusalem and other major cities, with the result that those former city-dwellers who remained in the land were dispersed throughout the country, and after conditions began to be stabilized in some measure, agriculture became once again the major occupation. Once again the people of Judah were predominately farmers or shepherds. Furthermore, it followed necessarily that with the destruction of the Temple the official religion of the people was decentralized. To a certain extent the sacrificial worship at the ancient local sanctuaries seems to have been revived ³⁾. Moreover, during this trying period, as was but natural, the cult of the synagogue seems to have evolved rapidly in Judah. Under circumstances such as these it is not in the least surprising that the ancient, pentecontad calendar should have come into its own once again as the generally observed folk-calendar of the Judean community. Consequently when eventually, under the beneficent rule of the first three Persian monarchs, it began to appear that the little Jewish people in Palestine might recover some measure of former dignity and self-government, the Temple might be rebuilt, and a new code of laws to regulate the

¹⁾ MORGENSTERN, "The Book of the Covenant, I", *HUCA* V (1928), 51 ff.; "The Gates of Righteousness", *HUCA* VI (1929), 31-35; "Supplementary Studies in the Calendars of Ancient Israel", *HUCA* X (1935), 6 ff.

²⁾ 1 Ki. xxiv 14; xxv 11.

³⁾ Cf. Lev. xvii 5, 7.

proper manner of living in accordance with the will of its God in the new period soon to dawn was formulated, the so-called Holiness Code, it is small wonder that the old, pentecontad calendar should be basic to the system of annual festivals provided for therein.

For certainly the calendar of the Holiness Code, set forth in Lev. xxiii and xxv, was the pentecontad calendar, with but very slight modification from its original form ¹⁾. The integration of the *Pesab* and *Maṣṣôt* Festivals, inaugurated by the Deuteronomic reformers, was retained but, as was only natural, instead of *Pesab* being made the dominant element in the composite festival, this lofty position was now assigned to the distinctly agricultural festival, *Maṣṣôt*. Accordingly the combined *Pesab*-*Maṣṣôt* Festival was now celebrated, no longer as under the provisions of the Deuteronomic legislation, upon the night of the new moon of 'Abib and during the seven days following immediately thereupon, but instead it was shifted to the precise moment when it was observed under the conditions of the pentecontad calendar, the seven days immediately preceding the cutting of the first sheaf of the new crop. Moreover, upon the fiftieth day following the day of the cutting of the first grain of the new crop and the bringing of the sheaf thereof, in other words as the closing festival of this "fifty", the Festival of Firstfruits was celebrated. Likewise at the time of the ingathering of the produce of the land the Festival of Ingathering was observed for the traditional period of seven days. This was undoubtedly the seven days *ṣapattum* which in the original pentecontad calendar followed immediately upon the close of the fourth "fifty". Moreover, this calendar of H makes especial provision for the observance of the *Š'mittah*, the Sabbatical year, every seventh year, and the Jubilee year every fiftieth year. That the Holiness Code sought to make the ancient pentecontad calendar official in the practice of the Jewish community of Judaea towards the close of the sixth century B.C., a procedure thoroughly comprehensible for a people whose economy had again become predominantly agricultural, is clear beyond all possibility of challenge.

However, it failed completely to achieve its purpose. The solar calendar was too intimately and basically associated with the Temple to make this possible. So soon as the second Temple was erected the solar calendar was revived in connection with its cult. In fact the

¹⁾ MORGENSTERN, "The Chanukkah Festival and the Calendar of Ancient Israel", *HUCA* XXI (1948), 447-457.

Temple was dedicated upon the New Year's Day, the day of the autumnal equinox and of the entrance of the Deity in the form of "the radiance of Yahweh" into the Temple, in 516 B.C. ¹⁾). There is cumulative evidence that the solar calendar continued to be employed as the official calendar of Judaism and of the Jewish community of Southern Palestine until it was eventually superseded, at some moment during the final quarter of the fifth century B.C., by the lunar calendar of the Priestly Reformation.

From this moment on this new, lunar calendar was recognized as the official calendar of Judaism, not only in Palestine but also in Babylon and in other lands where Jews were dwelling or in time came to dwell. Eventually an occasional slight compromise was made with some institution of the former, solar calendar. Thus, for example, during the course of the fourth century B.C. VII/10, the New Year's Day of the former solar calendar, the day of the autumnal equinox and of "the coming of the radiance of Yahweh" into the Temple, the consciousness of the sanctity of which had apparently persisted in the folk-belief and practice of the Jewish community of Judaea, was reconstituted as the Day of Atonement, and speedily came to be regarded, just as it had been under the conditions of the solar calendar, as the most sacred day of the entire year ²⁾).

To the ancient, pentecontad calendar, on the other hand, the Priestly reformers of the closing quarter of the fifth century B.C. apparently were not actively opposed. To its continued use they could of course give no official sanction, and least of all could they employ it in the official determination of the precise dates of the festivals and of other sacred occasions in the year. But, so far as we can see, they did not seek to abolish it completely, as they did the solar calendar. Accordingly the pentecontad calendar lived on and was carefully preserved among certain elements of the Jewish community, for the most part the rural, farming sections of the Jewish people, and especially those dwelling at a distance from Jerusalem and the Temple, and therefore not too completely amenable to priestly interpretation and administration of Judaism, the adherents of Peripheral Judaism, as it may very properly be called. Among different

¹⁾ MORGENSTERN, "A Chapter in the History of the High-Priesthood", *AJSL* LV (1938), 188 ff., 369 f.; "The Mythological Background of Psalm 82", *HUCA* XXIV (1939), 45-52.

²⁾ MORGENSTERN, "Two Prophecies of the Fourth Century B.C. and the Evolution of Yom Kippur", *HUCA* XXIV (1952-1953), 1-74.

groups of these peripheral or sectarian Jews the pentecontad calendar underwent various, minor modifications, such as the substitution of the solar month of thirty days for the "fifty" of the older calendar as a basic system of time-reckoning, and the change under the influence of the institution of the week running consecutively through the year, of the original "fifty" into a period of only forty-nine days, and, correspondingly, of the original jubilee from a period of fifty to one of forty-nine years. Thus the ancient, pentecontad calendar persisted in the ritual practice of different Jewish sectarian groups, found expression in the Book of Jubilees and other similar writings, in the cultic procedure of the Galileans of the time of Jesus, in Samaritan ritual to some extent, and in the tradition of the Jewish Karaite sect of the early Middle Ages, and persists in the folk-practice of the peasantry of Palestine of the present day.

Such in brief is the history of the pentecontad calendar in its Palestinian setting.

THE TWO "MESSIAHS" OF THE MANUAL OF DISCIPLINE

BY

LOU H. SILBERMAN

Nashville, Tennessee

One of the many points of contention in the interpretation of the so-called Manual of Discipline (DSD or IQS) concerns the meaning of ix 10-11: *wnšptw bmsšptym bršwnym 'šr hhlw 'nšy byhd ltyr bm 'd bw' nby' wmšyhy 'brwn wysr'l*.

Professor Millar BURROWS, writing in the *Anglican Theological Review* ¹⁾ in October 1952 concluded from his examination of the various possible meanings "that DSD [IQS] has a doctrine of two Messiahs as well as a coming prophet." At the same time Professor H. H. ROWLEY ²⁾ offered the contrary conclusion that "The sect itself . . . represents Israel and Aaron, and the title of the Messiah has reference to the character of the sect and not his personal descent. The Messiah who shall arise from Aaron and Israel is thus the Messiah who shall arise from the sect . . ."

A generation earlier a similar controversy had arisen over the interpretation of the thrice repeated phrase in the "Zadokite Document" *'d 'mwd mšyḥ 'brwn* ³⁾ *wysr'l* with APTOWITZER ⁴⁾ holding that the reference was to one Messiah, a descendant of both Levi and Judah, and GINZBERG ⁵⁾ suggesting contrariwise that the document conforms to the rabbinic doctrine of two Messiahs, a priestly and a Davidic redeemer. ⁶⁾ Essential to GINZBERG's thesis was the identi-

¹⁾ Vol. XXXIV, No. 4, pp. 202-206.

²⁾ *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 41, (cf. p. 38).

³⁾ This is the reading of the Zadokite Document Plate XV, lines 5-6 and Plate XVIII, line 8. Plate IX, line 40 reads *m'brwn*.

⁴⁾ *Parteilpolitik der Hasmonäerzeit* (1927), p. 91.

⁵⁾ *Eine Unbekannte jüdische Sekte* (1922). See especially pp. 352-353 and p. VII.

⁶⁾ *Loc. cit.*, "*mšwḥ 'brwn wysr'l* wird nur der Kürzer halber für *mšwḥ 'brwn wmwḥ ysrl* gebraucht, wie es eigentlich heissen müsste. Bei den eigentümlichen Orthographie unserer Schrift — vgl. S. 4 — wäre es sogar ganz gut möglich, dass

fication of Elijah with Phineas, the Messianic high-priest who was to anoint the Davidic Messiah; or, in other words, the union of prophet and priest in the *mšwḥ 'brwn*.¹⁾ However, this position cannot be held in interpreting the text of IQS for there the *nby'* is mentioned in addition to the *mšyhy 'brwn wyśr'l*.²⁾

Thus deprived of GINZBERG's arguments that lend support to a doctrine of two "Messiahs"³⁾ we must reexamine the text in order to determine who are referred to by the words *nby'* and *mšyhy 'brwn wyśr'l*.

One of the most potent factors in preventing a just estimate of our passage is the tendentious practice of capitalizing certain key words in our translation and our thinking. Thus BROWNLEE and BURROWS both translate *nby'* as Prophet with a capital P. Likewise does MILIK: Prophetae. BURROWS however recedes from this interpretive translation and thereafter speaks of "this prophet" without a capital letter and suggests that "the absence of an article with *nby'*", however, may indicate that no particular individual is meant . . ."⁴⁾

Closely connected with this tendency is that of translating by not translating, i.e., using a word that has been naturalized as a technical term into English or other western tongues as a translation of its source in Hebrew where the same technical meaning may not necessarily be present. This "crime" is compounded by capitalisation. Thus no one seems to have any compunction about translating *mšwḥ* or

mšwḥ für *mšwḥy* steht, so dass wir der Annahme es läge ein verkürzter Ausdruck vor, entbehren könnten". This orthographic conjecture is borne out by the IQS as read both by BURROWS (*op. cit.*, p. 204) and BROWNLEE (*BASOR*, Suppl. Studies, Nos. 10-13, New Haven, 1951, pp. 34-35).

¹⁾ *Op. cit.* pp. 348-349, "Mit anderen Worten: Elijahu als der messianische Hohepriester wird das heilige Öl zur Salbung des Messias besitzen . . ." And, p. 351, "Unsere Sekte kennt daher zwei Messiasse, den *mšwḥ 'brwn* 'den Gesalbten Aarons', d.h. Eliah, und den *mšwḥ yśr'l* 'den Gesalbten Israels', d. h. den Messias b. David, entsprechend dem *mšwḥ mlḥmb* und dem *mšwḥ mlkḥ 'l yśr'l* der Pesikta R."

²⁾ See above.

³⁾ See BURROWS, *op. cit.*, p. 205, "This prophet seems to be the most eligible candidate for identification with Elijah as the forerunner of the Messiah, or perhaps here as appearing together with the two Messiahs." And, "it seems much more likely that the Prophet is here distinguished from the Messiahs as their precursor or associate as often in both Jewish and early Christian sources."

⁴⁾ As to BROWNLEE's suggestion that *nby'* refers to the Messiah and *mšyhy 'brwn wyśr'l* are his followers, see BURROWS, *op. cit.*, p. 204, note 6.

BURROWS' suggestion that our passage represents "a change in the idea between CDC and DSD" is a question that need not be dealt with here. BURROWS, *op. cit.*, p. 205.

mšyḥ as Messiah with a capital M, ignoring the palpable fact that Messiah is a word loaded with two millennia of connotations beyond its use in our Ms. Only MILIK, translating into Latin, avoids the error, and then only in part: Unctorum, but unfortunately capitalised. 1) BROWNLEE can receive no credit for his "anointed ones of Aaron and Israel," for his "Messiah with a capital M" shines forth from its disguise as "Prophet with a capital P."

What is the crux of this complaint? The following quotation from BURROWS may illuminate our query: "The problem is not simplified by references to other quasi-Messianic characters. In DSD [IQS] itself there is no such reference (emphasis mine); in fact, while there are many eschatological allusions and implications elsewhere in DSD [IQS], the passage before us is the only one which can be called strictly Messianic." 2) In commenting on this, we need to remember that the potent word here is "eschatological." What does it mean when used in connection with our Ms? Does it imply a theory of a cosmic end *'wlm ḥb'*? or does it refer to the end of an era *ymwt ḥmšyḥ*? That there is a distinction between these two ideas is not at all unclear. *'wlm ḥb'* and *ymwt ḥmšyḥ* are not the same. The passage from "this world," i.e., "this period" to the *ymwt ḥmšyḥ* is in time, while the movement from "this period" or from *ymwt ḥmšyḥ* to *'wlm ḥb'* is out of time. I raise these questions for they seem to be crucial to our understanding of the passage, and our translations reveal unconscious adaptations of our material to generalisations that may be valid for other materials but may not necessarily be so for ours. With such warnings in mind we may now cautiously approach our task. We need to know what precisely the text is discussing.

From the context 3) we learn that at some time in the future, *b't ḥbyḥ*, certain developments will take place within the "community" with the establishment of certain institutions and the separation from non-members being rigidly enforced. The teaching of the Torah will be observed and "they will continue to be governed by the ancient codes by which from the first the community has been instructed, until the coming of a prophet and the anointed of Aaron and Israel."

What is the implication of the context? First, as I. RABINOWITZ

1) *Apud* BURROWS, *op. cit.*

2) *Ibid.*, p. 206.

3) Plate IX, 5 *et seq.*

has suggested ¹⁾, an immediate coming of these figures is not posited. The *status quo* will remain, i.e., there will be no change in the method of teaching Torah nor in the legal structure of the "community" until an authoritative teacher, a prophet, will come. But, we add, behind this deceptively simple statement there may lie a vast controversy concerning the whole nature of Torah.

LAUTERBACH, in his significant study "Midrash and Mishnah," ²⁾ discusses the sources of the conflict between the two parties that later developed into the Pharisees and Sadducees, and points out that it was the lay-teachers' creation of new methods of interpreting the Torah in opposition to the priestly interpreters that was at the basis of the division. Speaking of the priestly group he says: "In their opinion, the main thing was to observe the laws of the fathers as contained in the Book of the Law, because the people had pledged themselves by oath, in the time of Ezra, to do so." ³⁾ Apparently this opinion was shared by our community that was to continue to be governed by the "ancient codes by which from the first the community had been instructed," and whose problems, if any, would have to await the coming of an authorised teacher, a prophet. Thus in 1 Macc. iv 44-46 the solution of a legal problem, what to do with the defiled stones of the altar, is postponed "until a prophet should come."

Thus one function of the *nby'* seems clear; he will deal with those legal problems that the community, in clinging to the "ancient codes" (unlike its innovating rivals), cannot solve. This is, however, not his only function; for in our text, his coming is to be followed by the advent of the "anointed of Aaron and Israel." What then is his function with regard to these two? GINZBERG, as noted above, suggested that the priestly Messiah, Elijah = Phineas, would destroy the foes of the Davidic Messiah and would anoint the *mšwh ysr'l*. However, this latter function may be performed by the *nby'* of our text.

In 1 Macc. xiv we read of the election and confirmation of Simon as "leader and High Priest forever, until a true prophet should arise." Here the prophet's function would seem to be that of determining the continuing validity of the Hasmonean occupancy of the "leader-

¹⁾ *V.T.*, Vol. III, No. 2. Apr. 1953, p. 177.

²⁾ *Rabbinic Essays*, 1952, pp. 163-256.

³⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 209.

ship" and the High Priesthood. The prophet does not then come as the forerunner of a cosmic event, but as the inaugurator of a new era in which the proper pattern or structure of Israel will be reestablished. And what is that proper pattern or structure? The meaning of our crucial phrase *mšyby 'brwn ysr'l* will determine our answer.

GINZBERG suggested that the *mšwb ysr'l* referred to the *mšwb mlhmb* the "anointed battle-priest."¹) But perhaps the phrase implies something quite different. The Mekilta passage referred to by him says that Elijah, i.e., the prophet, will restore the oil of anointing. Now the anointing of the High priest had ceased, according to talmudic tradition, when Josiah had hidden the anointing oil.²) Since that time the High Priest had been, not *khn mšy* "anointed priest," but *khn mrwbh bgdym* "the priest of manifold garments." The Mishnah³) is careful to avoid any invidious distinction between the two, but as APTOWITZER points out: "Es ist also vorausgesetzt, dass solange das Salböl existiert hatte, die Salbung des Hohen-priesters auch vorgenommen werden musste." Proof of this contention he finds in the Baraita: "... even a High Priest who is the son of a High Priest must be anointed."⁴) Thus, according to this point of view (there were others),⁵) the coming of Elijah will see the re-establishment of the *khn mšy* "the anointed High Priest," the *mšwb 'brwn*.

As we have suggested above, according to 1 Macc. the prophet will solve the problems connected with kingship and priesthood. So too is our text to be understood: the ancient codes will govern *nšptw bmsptym bršwnym*, i.e., the *khn mrwbh bgdym* will remain in office until the prophet will restore the anointed priesthood in his stead.

But what of the *mšwb ysr'l*? Here too the passage from 1 Macc. is helpful. The status quo with regard to the kingship will remain until the coming of the prophet who will, and here we read between the lines, restore the Davidic dynast to the throne. Whether this involved the anointing of the Davidic king by the prophet (though as GINZBERG pointed out, talmudic tradition is contradictory on the question), or not, does not have here to be solved. In any case the prophet

¹) *Loc. cit.*

²) p. Horayot I, 4, (47c); see APTOWITZER, *op. cit.*, p. 1 and p. 192, note 2.

³) Meg. l. 9 and elsewhere, see APTOWITZER, *op. cit.*, p. 192, note 1.

⁴) b. Horay. 11 b.

⁵) See APTOWITZER, *op. cit.*, pp. 1 *et seq.*

Elijah is the forerunner of the *mšwḥ yšr'ł*, the Davidic dynast, who will be, with his help, established on the throne of Israel. ¹⁾)

Thus it would seem better not to translate the phrase as "Messiahs of Aaron and Israel," for the connotations involved may well lead us astray. Basically what is meant in the former case is "the anointed High Priest" as contrasted to the "High Priest of manifold garments" and in the latter, the "anointed king of Israel." Its eschatological overtones in the *common* usage of that term are practically non-existent. No cosmic upheaval is predicted but rather the end of an unsatisfactory situation through the re-establishment of the Davidic dynasty and the restoration of the High Priesthood to its original status. True enough the new era is contrasted with the old, but the end of the old is an end with a small "e" and if this is thought of as apocalyptic, it must be apocalyptic written like the aleph of *wyqr'* in the Massoretic text, *q'yr'*, in tiny print!

To conclude: it would appear that our passage, rather than being translated and understood with capitalised and connotation laden words, might well be translated quite simply "until the coming of a prophet and the anointed High Priest and the Davidic king"; the meaning, in keeping with the passages in 1 Macc., being: The status quo will remain and the community will maintain its isolation until a prophet will come who will set an anointed, not a garment-laden, High Priest in office and will re-establish the Davidic dynasty on the throne of Israel.

¹⁾ *Ibid.*, pp. 101 f.

SHORT NOTES

LHN: CHANTRE?

Dans son intéressant article „More Elephantine Papyri”, C. C. TORREY a étudié le mot *lhn* et lui suppose le sens de *chantre* ¹⁾. Déjà REIDER avait écrit: „*lhn* pourrait fort bien signifier un chantre de Yahu” ²⁾. J'étais arrivé à la même conclusion en étudiant les Papyri de Brooklyn ³⁾. Pourquoi, dès lors, revenir sur ce qui a été dit et bien dit? REIDER, on l'a vu, s'est contenté d'une simple affirmation. TORREY, de son côté, a bien envisagé la contre-partie féminine de *lhn* mais hors d'Éléphantine et il n'a pas non plus examiné les diverses opinions émises à ce sujet. Enfin ni l'un ni l'autre n'a mis en rapport ce chantre et cette chanteuse de Yaho avec ceux des cultes égyptiens. Ce sera mon excuse pour la publication de ces quelques pages.

Ananiah bar Azariah porte, dans les Papyri de Brooklyn, le titre de *lhn*. KRAELING donnerait volontiers à ce mot le sens de serviteur (p. 145). Le terme n'est pas nouveau. Il s'était déjà rencontré dans *Aramaic Papyri*, 63, 9 et 12 ⁴⁾. Dans le premier passage il est accolé à נגרא que DRIVER rapproche de *nağğār*: *charpentier, menuisier* ⁵⁾.

Mais *lhn* a, dans nos papyri, une contre-partie féminine. Dans 12,2 la dame *Tpmt* est, en effet, qualifiée de *lhnḥ*, titre parallèle à celui de son époux. *Tpmt* est-elle appelée *lhnḥ* parce que son mari exerce la fonction de *lhn* ou bien est-elle elle-même chargée de cet emploi? KRAELING est d'avis (pp. 145 et 274) que la dame *Tpmt* ne doit son titre qu'à l'emploi tenu par Ananiah et il invoque, à l'appui de son opinion, le passage où la femme d'Isaïe (viii 3) est qualifiée de prophétesse.

Aucun des auteurs précités n'a critiqué cette conclusion. Elle est cependant d'importance. Si Ananiah exerce seul la fonction de *lhn* il suffira de trouver un emploi qui lui convienne. Si Ananiah et *Tpmt*

¹⁾ *JNES*, XIII (1954), p. 149 ss.

²⁾ *JQR*, 1954, p. 339.

³⁾ E. G. KRAELING, *The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri*.

⁴⁾ A. COWLEY, *Aramaic Papyri*, p. 167.

⁵⁾ *Analecta Orientalia*, XII (1935), p. 59.

ont une même fonction, le champ des recherches sera singulièrement circonscrit, surtout en ce qui concerne le mot *lḥnb* et l'on pourra faire justice d'un certain nombre de dérivations proposées pour ce vocable.

A mon avis la comparaison instituée par KRAELING ne vaut pas. La femme d'Isaïe n'est pas dite: *prophétesse de Yahvé* mais la *prophétesse*, sans plus. *Tpmt*, au contraire, n'est pas seulement *lḥnb* mais *lḥnb ṣ y Yhw*, *lḥnb* de Yaho, comme son mari est, lui, *lḥn ṣ y Yhw*, *lḥn* de Yaho. Si leurs titres sont parallèles, ce n'est donc pas du seul fait de leur mariage, mais parce qu'ils exercent tous deux une même fonction qu'il nous reste à déterminer.

L'office d'Ananiah relevait-il du culte ou est-ce un emploi dans le domaine du dieu? Il semble impossible, pour le moment, de le préciser car Hôr (6, 8) est serviteur de Khnoum ('*bd ṣ y Ḥnm*) ou jardinier de Khnoum (*gnn ṣ y Ḥnm*), ce qui le rattache, sans conteste, au service du domaine du dieu et non à son culte.

Le féminin *lḥnb*, plus fréquent que le masculin, apportera-t-il quelque lumière sur la signification de ce terme?

Disons de suite, avant d'entreprendre la revue des passages où il se rencontre, que l'unanimité est loin d'être faite à son propos.

Tout d'abord un passage de la Sagesse d'Aḥiqar (83)¹) renferme un mot dans lequel KRAELING retrouve, peut-être avec raison, celui dont nous cherchons le sens:

Un soufflet pour un esclave ('*lym*)

Une réprimande (pour une) *lḥnt*

Et pour tous tes serviteurs ('*bdyk*) la discipline (?).

Selon KRAELING *lḥnb* serait pour *llḥnb*, la présence du *lamed* initial ayant provoqué la chute de la préposition. Il faudrait donc chercher cette catégorie de personnes dans le personnel domestique. Un doute subsiste cependant sur la chute du *lamed* et, partant, sur la forme *ḥnb* adoptée par COWLEY qui la traduit par *maid-servant* ou la forme *lḥnb* restituée par KRAELING qui retient la même traduction.

La principale référence se trouve au livre de *Daniel* (v 2, 3, 23). Au cours du grand festin auquel il convia un millier de ses princes, le roi Balthazar fit apporter, nous dit-on, les vases d'or et d'argent que Nabuchodonosor avait enlevés du temple de Jérusalem, afin que le roi et ses princes, *šglth wḥnth* s'en servissent pour boire. On traduit respectivement ces mots par: *ses femmes et ses concubines*.

Nous examinerons par la suite la raison de cette traduction. Disons

¹) COWLEY, *op. cit.* p. 215.

simplement pour le moment que, partant du sens de concubine attribué par les Targums à **לחִינְתָּא**, on s'est efforcé de découvrir une racine sémitique qui pût aboutir à cette signification.

En 1927 BAUMGARTNER proposait de faire dériver ce mot de l'acadien *la-ḥa-na-tu*: *Dirne*, lui-même de *laḥannu*: *Gefäss*¹⁾.

En 1935 B. LANDSBERGER écrivait à ce propos: „Que les **לחִינְתָּא** qui sont à côté des **שְׁלִיחָא** (c'est-à-dire: *ša ekalli*: *femmes du palais*) en compagnie du roi Balthazar (Dan 5, 2; 3; 23) ne soient pas, comme le veut la tradition, des concubines mais bien plutôt des esclaves du palais, en fait des meunières (de l'assyrien *laḥḫinātu*), je ne puis que le suggérer, non l'affirmer”²⁾. Enfin LÉWY, en 1950, renvoie à BAUMGARTNER et ajoute d'autres références pour appuyer la thèse: *σχεῦος* = **כְּלִי** = *laḥannu*: *femme*³⁾. Peut-on choisir entre ces diverses suggestions? Les données des Papyri de Brooklyn restreignent beaucoup le champ des hypothèses. La mention d'une femme qualifiée de *lḥn* *Yhw* oblige à exclure le sens de *concubine*. S'il y a eu, en Égypte, des pallacides d'Amon, il n'y en a jamais eu, que nous sachions, de Yaho. D'autre part, nous l'avons vu, Ananiah est *lḥn* de Yaho et l'on doit écarter toute dérivation de *laḥannu*: *vase*. De plus la présence de *lḥnt* au festin officiel de Balthazar milite, me semble-t-il, contre la suggestion: *meunières* faite par LANDSBERGER. On n'aurait point invité ces esclaves à la table royale.

S'il faut écarter une dérivation de *laḥannu*: *vase*, on ne peut non plus conserver la traduction *serviteur* ou *servante*. Il y a, en sémitique, toutes les racines qu'il faut pour désigner un serviteur et *lḥn* n'a jamais eu ce sens. Puisque l'emploi peut être exercé à la fois par un homme et par une femme et se réfère, en certains cas, à un domaine divin et, plus probablement, à un culte, on ne voit que la racine *lḥn* de l'arabe qui satisfasse à toutes les exigences du problème. La racine aurait aussi existé en araméen.

La présence d'un chantre dans les cérémonies du culte de Yaho est tout à fait normale. Mais ce fonctionnaire laïque, devait avoir, à l'instar de nos modernes chantres de village, un autre gagne-pain. Le qualificatif de *ngr* que nous avons vu accolé au nom de *lḥn* et que DRIVER interprète par *charpentier*, *menuisier* s'entend dès lors fort bien.


On est plus étonné de la présence d'une chanteuse de Yaho.

¹⁾ ZAW, XLV (1927), p. 90.

²⁾ AfO, X (1935-36), p. 150.

³⁾ Orientalia, XIX (1950), p. 35, n. 3.

Cet étonnement disparaît lorsqu'on se reporte à la liturgie des temples égyptiens. Ils possédaient, en effet, de tels chantres et de telles chanteuses. A propos de Panehsy, dont le tombeau se trouve à Dirâ abû 'n-nâga M. DRIOTON écrit: „Quant aux chanteurs, *šm'.w*, dont Panehsy était le chef, ce n'étaient vraisemblablement pas, suivant la remarque de SCHARFF, *Briefe aus Illahun*, dans la *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde*, t. LIX, p. 46-47, des chanteurs de profession (*ḥsw*) mais des employés ou des travailleurs qui, en marge de leurs occupations, chantaient dans le temple ¹⁾ et, dans le cas présent, composaient les chœurs qui accompagnaient les repas du dieu ²⁾”.

Ce Panehsy était chef des chanteurs de la table d'Amon. Son épouse Tarenou était, de son côté, chanteuse d'Amon ³⁾. M. G. LEFEBVRE, faisant allusion à ces chanteurs et à ces chanteuses écrit: „Il existait un clergé féminin d'Amon, comme aussi bien des autres divinités d'Égypte. Tous les temples possédaient un nombre extraordinaire de musiciennes ou „chanteuses” (): leur office d'ailleurs était très simple, consistant à chanter, à agiter le sistre dans les fêtes et à accroître par leur présence la pompe des cérémonies”. „J'ajoute que leur rôle pouvait correspondre à celui des hommes, simples laïques, portant le titre de *ḥsy Imn* „chanteur d'Amon” (ainsi, PIERRET, *Lowre*, I, p. 98, etc.)” ⁴⁾.

Le couple Ananiah-*Tpmt* aurait un bon répondant dans le couple Panehsy-Tarenou, dont on pourrait sans doute trouver d'autres exemples, mais qui suffit à illustrer notre démonstration. Cela projetterait un peu de lumière sur les cérémonies du culte de Yaho.

Nous pouvons maintenant passer en revue les autres passages pour voir si le sens de *chanteuse* satisfait aux exigences du contexte.

Remarquons de suite que des chanteuses seraient fort bien en situation au festin de Balthazar. Pourquoi, cependant, s'en est-on tenu au sens péjoratif de concubine? La faute en est, peut-être, au premier terme: *šēgāl*. Ce mot ne se rencontre qu'en deux autres endroits. Dans *Nébémie* (ii 6) il s'applique à la compagne d'Artaxerxès, assise auprès de lui et, dans le *Ps.* xlv 10 on traduit aussi *šēgāl* par reine. Si *šēgāl* signifie *reine, épouse de premier rang*, le second

¹⁾ C'est moi qui souligne.

²⁾ *Mém. Inst. Franç.* LVII, fasc. 2, p. 49, n. 2.

³⁾ *Ibid.* p. 17.

⁴⁾ *Histoire des Grands Prêtres d'Amon de Karnak*, p. 33 et n. 5.

mot ne saurait, pense-t-on, que désigner des concubines¹). Le *Cantique* (vi 8), à la suite du *Livre des Rois* (1 *Reg.* xi 3) n'associe-t-il pas reines (מלכות) et concubines (פלגשים).

Est-on cependant en droit de poser l'équivalence מלכת פלגש = שגל לחנה? Pour résoudre ce problème, il faut d'abord se demander qui pouvait prendre part à un banquet officiel. CHARLES, dans son *Commentaire sur Daniel*²), a recueilli sur ce point les témoignages des écrivains classiques. Si selon Q. Curce, v 1, 38, les femmes assistaient aux festins en Babylonie au temps d'Alexandre, il n'en allait pas toujours de même en Perse. Au dire d'Hérodote, v 18, les concubines et les épouses légitimes avaient coutume de prendre place auprès de leurs époux dans les fêtes. Plutarque (*Symp.* i 1) et Macrobe (vii 1), d'autre part, affirment positivement que les Perses permettaient à leurs concubines mais non à leurs épouses d'assister à de tels festins. Aélien (*Var. Hist.* xii 1) rapporte qu'après s'être gorgés de nourriture les Perses s'adonnent au vin. Au cours d'un de ces banquets on amena à Cyrus quatre jeunes filles grecques dont trois avaient été très bien formées aux εταίρικὰ ἔργα. Le récit de Josèphe (*Ant.* XI, vi 1) appuyerait ce dernier point de vue car, selon lui, c'est par égard pour les lois perses que Vasthi refusa de se rendre à la fête malgré l'ordre du roi. Il n'est donc pas certain qu'il faille conserver, pour ces deux termes, au reste omis par la Septante, la traduction reçue: épouse-concubine.

Au surplus ce n'est peut-être pas l'équivalence où nous avons cru voir l'origine de la traduction traditionnelle, mais la simple présence des *lḥnt* dans les festins qui leur aura valu cette mauvaise réputation et les aura, finalement, fait assimiler aux concubines³).

Le sens de chanteuses conviendrait non moins bien dans le passage de la Sagesse d'Ahiqar si on lit ce nom avec KRAELING. La *lḥnb* se trouverait placée entre l'esclave (*lym*) et le serviteur (*bd*). On sait que les grands, en Orient, et notamment en Égypte, avaient dans

¹) Le mot šēgāl demeure inexpliqué en dépit des suggestions faites sur son étymologie. On les trouvera dans la note de A. CAQUOT: "la déesse Šegal", *Semítica*, IV, pp. 55-58. Les Targums ne mentionnent pas ce mot, et, dans les quelques passages où l'hébreu rabbinique l'emploie, il n'a pas gardé son sens honorable d'épouse.

²) *Commentary on Daniel*, p. 116.

³) Les termes chanteuse et musicienne étaient souvent pris par les Égyptiens dans le sens de „femme de joyeuse vie”. On donne pour compagne à Ounamon, retenu en Syrie, une chanteuse venue d'Égypte. GAUTHIER, *Le personnel du dieu Min*, p. 112, n. 2.

leur domesticité des chanteuses pour agrémenter leurs banquets ¹⁾.

Je crois donc qu'on peut tenir pour assuré le sens de *chanteuse* pour le mot *lḥnb*. Ce sera un nouvel apport des papyri de Brooklyn.

Jérusalem

B. COUROYER

THE TEXT AND MEANING OF HOSEA XIV 3

In his suggestive paper, "Echoes of Canaanite Literature in the Psalms" (*VT*, vol. 4, Apr. 1954) Father Roger T. O'CALLAGHAN, whose untimely death is a great loss to Biblical scholarship, discusses Hos. xiv 3c, among other Biblical passages. The difficulties of the traditional interpretations of MT are patent, whether we render "we will pay the calves of our lips" ²⁾ or "we will pay, as with bullocks, with our lips" ³⁾ or "we will render, (as) for bullocks, the offerings of our lips." ⁴⁾ He therefore interprets Hos. xiv 3c יְגַשְׁלֵמָה פָּרִים יִשְׁפְּתֵנוּ as *pārē-m šḥphātēnū*, treating the *mem* of Masoretic *pārīm* as the enclitic, which has become familiar from Ugaritic, and rendering the stich as "we shall pay the bullocks of our pens." Incidentally, in explaining *šḥphātēnū* as "pens, enclosures" he was anticipated by TUR-SINAI ⁵⁾ and, even earlier, by DUHM.

However, this interpretation does not commend itself, either from the standpoint of content or of language. In pleading for Israel's ideal repentance, the prophet is hardly likely to urge sacrifices, in view of his stress upon love and inward devotion as the highest forms of worship and his sarcastic reference to animal offerings, as in v 6: "With their flocks and cattle do they go to seek the Lord and they do not find Him." Syntactically, too, the accusative after *šilleṃ* generally represents the debt or obligation being discharged ⁶⁾, not the object of payment ⁷⁾. Most frequently by far the verb governs *neder* "vow" in the accusative. ⁸⁾

¹⁾ Cf. également le *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, art. *Chantres*.

²⁾ So CALVIN, G. A. SMITH, 'AV.

³⁾ So EWALD, CHEYNE.

⁴⁾ So *American Standard Revised Version*, *Jewish Publication Society Version*.

⁵⁾ Cf. E. BEN JEHUDA, *Thesaurus Totius Linguae Hebraicae*, vol. X, pp. 5129a.

⁶⁾ Cf. e.g. Ex. xxi 36 (*šōr*); Ex. xx 12 (*šrēphāh*); Ex. xxii 5 (*bē'ērāh*); 2 Kings iv 7 (*nīf'ēkh*); 1 Sam. xii 6 (*kibbsāh*); Joel ii 25 (*baššānīm*); Prov. xix 17 (*gemūl*), etc.

⁷⁾ The only instances are in the legal phraseology of the Covenant Code (Ex. xxi 37; xxii 3 ff.).

⁸⁾ Cf. *inter alia* Deut. xxiii 22; 2 Sam. xv 7; Is. xix 21; Nah. i 15; Ps. xxii 26; l 14; lxi 9, lxv 2; lxvi 13; cxvi 14, 18; Prov. vii 14; Job xxii 26; Ecc. v 3.

The exigencies of the passage were recognized by LXX: καὶ ἀνταποδώσομεν καρπὸν χειλέων ἡμῶν and by *Pesitta*: ספגסוֹמֵחַ פִּלּוֹן וְשִׁפְתֵּי אֲחֵרִי. A long catena of scholars accordingly emend MT to read פָּרִי שְׁפָתַי¹⁾.

This emendation is, however, unnecessary, if we recognize that the *mem* is enclitic, and revocalize Masoretic *pārīm* as *peri-m* rendering the stich "we shall pay the fruit of our lips, i.e., we shall fulfill our spoken vows to God." On "the fruit of the lips," as a figure for "speech" cf. נִיב שְׁפָתַיִם (Is. lvii 19; cf. also Prov. x 31) and פָּרִי פִי אֵי (Prov. xii 14; xiii 2; xviii 20).

The difficulty of the clause כָּל - תִּשָּׂא עוֹן is obviated if we emend כָּל to בַּל and render the particle, on the basis of the Ugaritic usage, as an asseverative, "Indeed, forgive our iniquity."²⁾ We have indicated elsewhere³⁾ that Biblical *lō'* is likewise used asseveratively, "indeed," a meaning which probably arose from its use in rhetorical questions, like the Latin *nonne*. This interrogative-asseverative use of *lō'* is frequent in Rabbinic literature, where the identical passage occurs in parallel sources with and without *lō'*. The usage is also to be met with, we believe, in Hos. x 9; xi 5, as well as in the crux Isa. vii 27.⁴⁾

The enigmatic וְקַח - טוֹב has been variously interpreted as "take it well that we pay" or "accept what is good, i.e., that we pay", or "let thyself be gracious" or "take good things."⁵⁾ On the basis of the first two stichs we suggest that the clause is to be rendered "accept our speech."

The Biblical and Rabbinic root *dbb* "speak" (Cant. vii 10) from which *dibbāh* "report, evil report" (Gen. xxxvii 2; Num. xiv 37) is derived (cf. Akkadian *dabābu* "speak, charge"), apparently has a cognate *ṭōb*, *ṭbb*. Thus *dibbāh* is rendered as טִיבָא by Onkelos and as

¹⁾ So DUHM, OORT, WELLHAUSEN, NOWACK, HARPER, SELLIN, T. H. ROBINSON, and the Lexicons of BDB, and KOEHLER-BAUMGARTNER.

²⁾ Cf. O'CALLAGHAN's remarks, *op. cit.* p. 166, where the asseverative use of *bl* is suggested for Ps. xvi 2.

³⁾ Cf. „Studies in the Relationship of Biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew” in the *Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volumes* (New York 1945), English volume, pp. 181-3.

⁴⁾ Note that the parallel clause in Hos. xi 5 is in the declarative. See the above paper for details.

⁵⁾ Cf. HARPER, *ICC on Hosea* p. 411. ROBINSON emends וְקַח to וְקַחָה „Lass uns empfangen Gutes”, which helps but little.

לְבַחֵם by *Pešitta* in Gen. xxxvii 2 and by טאבא by the Targum on Prov. x 18.

In Neh. vi 19 טוֹבְתִי is parallel to דְּבָרִי: "His utterances they were wont to repeat to me and my words they would bring to him." This, LXX (B, A and α) recognized, rendering both nouns identically by λόγους "words."

The same meaning for the root *ṭob* would seem to occur in the difficult phrase of Ps. xxxix 3b הִתְשַׁיִּיתִי מִטוֹב, where many commentators emend to מְכַאֵב, which is impossible, or delete the word entirely. The phrase is to be rendered literally: "I am silent from speaking" i.e., "I refrain from speaking," and thus it constitutes an excellent parallel to the first stich נִאֲלַמְתִּי דוֹמִיָּה, which is also to be translated "I am quiet in speech."¹ The same meaning for *ṭōb* may also occur in Job xxxiv 3 and in Hos. iii 5.

Our passage now receives a clear and appropriate meaning, without any radical emendation. The prophet pleads with Israel to voice its repentance before God:

"Take words with yourselves and return to the Lord,
Say to Him,

"Thou wilt indeed forgive our iniquity and accept our speech,
And we shall render (unto Thee) the fruit of our lips.' "

New York

ROBERT GORDIS

'EYN 'ADAM (ZACH. IX 1)

La seconde partie du livre de Zacharie présente dès le début une difficulté. „*La parole du Seigneur*” commence le texte, et il poursuit „*est dans le pays de Hadrah* (capitale d'un Etat indépendant dont le nom a aussi désigné la province assyrienne de *Hatarikka* entre Alep et Hamat) et à Damas est sa résidence; car à Yahvé est 'eyn 'adam et toutes les tribus d'Israel.” Que signifie l'expression 'eyn 'Adam?

Les Septante ont compris: „Son sacrifice (*minḥab*) parce que l'œil du Seigneur est tourné vers les hommes et toutes les tribus d'Israel.” Le Targum interprète à peu près de la même manière. Que disent les commentateurs juifs de l'époque médiévale? R. Shelômôh Jiṣḥaḳî

¹ On this meaning of *ṭbb* cf. M. SEIDEL in *Debir* (Berlin 5683 = 1923) page 33. On *dmm* in the meaning of "speak" cf. Ps. xxii 3 (note the parallelism); xxxiv 15; lxii 2?; lxiv 2 and perhaps the famous phrase in 1 Ki. xix 12.

(Rashi) traduit: „Parce que vers le Seigneur est tourné l'œil de l'homme”. Ibn Ezra hésite: 'Adam est-il le nom d'un règne ou le nom d'un roi? La prophétie se réalisera (litt. „se posera”) sur *Damas*; c'est qu'un grand nombre de citoyens de *Damas* se convertiront au Seigneur et se soumettront au royaume méridional d'Israel. Voici maintenant l'interprétation de R. David Qimḥi (Redaq): la majesté et la prophétie du Seigneur se poseront sur *Ḥadrakh*, et à *Damas* entièrement sur Israel. Le pouvoir de Jérusalem s'étendra donc jusqu'à *Damas*, les yeux de tous les hommes se tourneront vers le Seigneur et ils ne regarderont plus les idoles; tous les Etats que mentionne la prophétie rendront hommage au Seigneur, à plus forte raison toutes les tribus d'Israel.

Que disent les commentateurs modernes? MARTI change le texte (*Die Heilige Schrift* de KAUTSCH-BERTHOLET, 1923 II, p. 99): „Parce que *Aram* (au lieu de 'Adam) a péché contre le Seigneur et tous ceux qui haïssent (!) Israel.” SELLIN traduit ainsi (*Das Zwölfprophetenbuch*, II, 1930, p. 546): „Parce que c'est à Yahvé qu'est l'œil d'Aram comme de toutes les tribus d'Israel”. HORST (*Die zwölf Kl. Proph.*, Tübingen, 1938, p. 238): „Parce que les villes d'Aram ainsi que toutes les tribus d'Israel appartiennent au Seigneur.” NÖTSCHER (*Echterbibel*, Würzburg, 1948, p. 159s.) garde ce sens: „*Damas* comme les autres capitales tombées sous la domination assyrienne seront, ainsi qu'Israel, dépendantes de Yahvé, *Damas* est l'œil d'Aram”. La *Bible suisse* (Zürich, 1939, p. 1902) fait de même („parce que les villes — 'arey — d'Aram et toutes les tribus d'Israel sont au Seigneur.”). Enfin A. GÉLIN (*Aggée, Zacharie, Malachie*, Paris, éd. Cerf 1948, p. 43) traduit: „car à Yahvé appartiennent les villes d'Aram aussi bien que toutes les tribus d'Israel.”

Mais, tout en gardant pour l'expression un sens géographique, ne pourrait-on traduire, sans changer le texte: „Parce que les sources de 'Adam et (le territoire) de toutes les tribus d'Israel sont au Seigneur”?

'Eyn 'Adam pourrait en effet être le nom d'une ville; à moins que, plus simplement encore, notre texte n'entende parler des eaux de la ville et des environs de 'Adam, c'est-à-dire *Ed-Damieh*. Cette ville dont parle Josué se trouve au sud de *Sartan* et on l'a identifiée avec *Tell-el-Saidīyeh* sur le Jourdain. Les pluies de printemps favorisaient comme de nos jours la fonte des neiges sur le Mont Hermon (cf. ABEL, *Josué*, Cerf 1950, p. 23, note) et il en résultait une crue du fleuve au temps de la moisson (Jos. iii 15; cf. M. NOTH, *Das*

*Buch Josua*², 1953, p. 36) qui menaçait d'inonder la vallée du Jourdain.

Comme dans le Psaume lxviii 19 (cf. E. ZOLLI, *Il Salterio*, Milano, Viola, 1950, p. 108), il est donc fait allusion à des victoires du temps passé, de même que Zach. ix 1 parle de traditions anciennes dont le Talmud de Babylone (*Soṭah* 34a) a gardé le souvenir (c'est moins clair dans le Talmud palestinien) tout en les embellissant de légendes. Zacharie semble donc vouloir rappeler les prodiges opérés par le Seigneur et son œuvre providentielle en terre d'Israel. Mais Dieu est aussi le Seigneur de tous les pays dont le Prophète va parler par la suite.

Roma

E. ZOLLI

REVIEWS

J. SIMONS, *Jerusalem in the Old Testament, Researches and Theories*, E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1952. Pp. 517, Pls. xxxiii, Figs. 64.

Any person who has attempted research in the topography of ancient Jerusalem knows how baffling but fascinating its problems are. The book under review is one of two notable studies in this area which have appeared recently. It would be instructive as well as interesting to review SIMONS' book together with VINCENT's *Jérusalem de l'Ancien Testament*. That, however, is not feasible at present; indeed, SIMONS' book by itself deserves more extended discussion than can be given here.

The preface states the book's purpose as "a comprehensive synthesis of all literary and archaeological data concerning biblical Jerusalem." It is recognized that while the data are abundant and complicated they are scarcely complete enough at any point to allow final and unequivocal judgments. The book ends, in fact, with a reluctant confession of insufficient information. The treatment is limited to the time between the reign of David and the destruction of the city by the Romans, except that the site of the Holy Sepulchre is discussed in connection with the problem of the second wall. To save space I shall follow the chapter headings and note briefly some of the author's most significant positions.

I. *Orientation*. Jerusalem differs from other ancient cities of Palestine in the fact that excavation of the whole site is impossible, but literary records are abundant. Archeological and literary data must therefore be combined. SIMONS gives a thorough and meticulously accurate history of previous topographical studies.

II. *The City of Josephus and the "City of David"*. The only methodical description of Jerusalem in our sources is that of Josephus. The biblical references assume a knowledge of what we wish to learn. After surveying earlier misinterpretations of Josephus, SIMONS records the establishment of the southeastern hill as the earliest occupied site. He identifies the Cheesemakers' Valley with the central valley, the Upper Market with the western hill, and the Akra or Lower City with the eastern hill.

III. *The South-Eastern Hill. A. Sion, City of David, and Ophel*. Against the views of DALMAN and VINCENT, SIMONS argues that "Stronghold of Sion" and "City of David" are respectively the Jebusite (or Canaanite) and Israelite names of the same fortress. Ophel is the bulge in the central section of the southeastern hill above the Kedron Valley.

B. *Excavations on the South-Eastern Hill*. Palestinian archeology, as SIMONS says, has "missed here one of its finest chances". There has been no comprehensive excavation, and much of what has been done was done

before adequate methods of excavation and recording had been developed. SIMONS discusses the remains of walls found in the excavations in connection with the question when the southwestern hill was first enclosed. He makes much of WEILL's discovery of the "Stairs of the City of David" and the gate at the same point, which he identifies with the Fountain Gate. This necessitates the identification of the Dung Gate with the monumental gate found by BLISS at the most southerly point of the circumvallation, serving the central valley and the southwestern hill. The "Gate Between the Two Walls" is equated with the Dung Gate.

C. *Millo and Akra*. Theories concerning the location of the Millo are critically examined, the result being a *non liquet*. The Syrian Akra is located on the southeastern hill, the arguments of VINCENT and ABEL for another location being carefully refuted.

D. *The Waterworks of the City of David*. After a description of the rock channel and shafts in the southeastern hill, SIMONS discusses the identification of the *sinnôr* with the underground passage to the spring and very cautiously comes to the conclusion that this is more probable than other theories. The text involved (2 Sam. v 6-8) is translated, "Whoever smites the Jebusite and arrives at the *sinnôr*." The other waterworks and the location of the pools mentioned in the Old Testament are considered with equal care.

E. *The Royal Necropolis*. The tombs of the kings of Judah have not been and are not likely to be discovered. For the problem of the curves in Hezekiah's tunnel SIMONS proposes a partial solution: The northern curve is unexplained, but the southern curve is attributed to the desire to reach the eastern side of the ridge from Siloam as quickly as possible; the work was begun, SIMONS suggests, by boring the shaft where the tunnel turns north and connecting this with Siloam. The other gang of workers, starting at the spring, perhaps wrought confusion by heading west instead of south.

IV. *The South-Western Hill and the "Early Wall"*. Excavations on the southwestern hill have not revealed the time when it was enclosed in the city walls. SIMONS argues that its incorporation was pre-exilic, probably at the time of Solomon. One may question some of his inferences from biblical data. The most convincing evidence is Hezekiah's tunnel, which is indeed hard to explain on the basis of the one-hill theory. Much less impressive is the inference from 2 Sam. v 6 ff. that David marched against Jerusalem but captured the Stronghold of Sion. SIMONS holds that Jerusalem was the settlement on both hills, Sion being the fortified eastern hill. Joshua's failure to take Jerusalem and its capture by Judah (Ju. i 8) are explained by the very dubious supposition that Joshua took the southwestern hill but could not expel the Jebusites from their fortress on Sion. SIMONS is probably right, however, in taking the story of Obed-Edom and the ark as indicating that the southwestern hill was inhabited, though unwallled, in the time of David. SIMONS calls his theory a compromise between the one-hill and the two-hill theories.

On the north the fragments of walls hitherto discovered have not been well enough studied or recorded to indicate their date or to show

whether they were parts of the same wall. SIMONS' discussion of Herod's Towers is an especially good example of his care and independence in the use of archeological data. He concludes that archeology has not yet revealed a northern wall as old as the biblical data would lead us to expect, though an exclusively post-exilic date of all the finds has not been proved.

On the south the wall found by BLISS may have replaced an earlier one, SIMONS suggests. The problem of the tombs on the southwestern hill is fairly dealt with. Concerning the gates, the most important point in SIMONS' position is his location of the Valley Gate at the southwestern corner of the western hill, for which he makes a very good case.

V. The "*Second Wall*" and the *Problem of the Holy Sepulchre*. Since the location of the second wall plays a decisive part in the controversy concerning Golgotha and the Holy Sepulchre, these problems cannot be kept entirely apart. SIMONS holds Edward ROBINSON responsible for making the discussion a semi-religious dispute by his "anti-traditional or rather anti-ecclesiastical mentality." The psychological factors in the situation are recognized and rightly deplored, and SIMONS declares that "no dogmatic or confessional interests are at stake." Here we must heartily agree with him.

Discussing the Mishneh of the Old Testament, SIMONS denies that archeological discoveries require a starting point for the second wall near the northwestern corner of the city, making the Gennath Gate a gate in the second wall. Details of his argument might be questioned if space permitted, but we may agree that the inclusion of Golgotha and the Holy Sepulchre in the second wall "has practically no archaeological support whatever." The walls of Hezekiah and Manasseh are taken to be complementary parts of a single extension "incorporating all that since the days of Solomon has sprung up on the *north* and on the *east* side of the city." One of the least satisfactory sections in the book is the discussion of the Upper Pool, which SIMONS locates "in the depression northwest of the Damascus Gate where the Central Valley begins." The Benjamin Gate is much more probably located, not in the northern wall, but near the northern end of the eastern wall.

VI. *The Temple-Area*. A. *Haram esh-Sharīf*. The careful description of the topography of this area requires no special discussion here.

B. *The Problem of the Temple*. An interesting discussion of Herodian masonry leads to the view that an archeological demonstration of its Herodian date is "unfeasible." An analysis of the statements of Josephus establishes the substantial identity of the present Haram and the Herodian sanctuary, but a new interpretation of Herod's operations and a partial revision of the concept of Herodian masonry are suggested. At the northwest corner, SIMONS maintains, the area did not extend as far as Antonia, which was connected with it by a post-Herodian extension. On the east, Herod adopted an older city wall for the sanctuary, demolishing only its southernmost section to make way for his portico. On the west, WILSON's Arch and the adjoining causeway represent the passage across the valley, BARCLAY's Gate represents the southernmost gate in the western wall, while ROBINSON's Arch did not support a causeway but a balcony overlooking the central valley. The royal palace was not the Hasmonean palace on the

promontory of the western hill, but the gate and bridge at WILSON'S Arch were continued by a dam to Herod's palace on the site of the present Citadel. SIMONS concludes that "the dazzling panorama enjoyed by Christ's contemporaries" cannot now be reconstructed; much less the city of Solomon. "Nothing warrants the hope," he says, "that the complete independence of Palestine, now finally achieved, will bring about any change for the better." The assumption that complete independence has been achieved seems now even more unrealistic than any dream of an adequate excavation of Jerusalem.

VII. *The City of Nehemiah*. Recognizing both the value and the difficulties of Nehemiah's topographical texts, SIMONS claims that elements from other sources can be combined with Nehemiah's descriptions to make a complete and plausible outline of the city. Apart from some details, he has probably succeeded here as well as anyone ever can. His contention that Nehemiah's descriptions are "emotional," however, calls for a mild protest. That Nehemiah's nocturnal inspection of the walls was not practical but emotional seems very unlikely. SIMONS insists that the tour was not incomplete. Issuing from the Valley Gate, he maintains, Nehemiah went down the path at the bottom of the Valley of Hinnom, approached the walls closely only at the Dung Gate, and then had to go down into the Kedron again. The next section of the wall, being low and therefore dangerous, "called for a close inspection"—practically or emotionally? From the northwest angle, Nehemiah hastily proceeded along the north and west sides of the city, where he found nothing to report. If so, why was this part of the tour considered necessary? The procession text of Nehemiah xii is discussed clearly and reasonably. In the reconstruction text of chapter iii SIMONS finds himself compelled to assume a departure from the topographical sequence at the Fountain Gate.

VIII. *The "Third Wall" or the Wall of Herod Agrippa*. Here again the dispute is emotionally and historically, though not logically, connected with the authenticity of the Holy Sepulchre. SIMONS argues that the discoveries of SUKENIK and MAYER along the wall discovered by ROBINSON have been fatal to the theory that this was the third wall of Josephus. A "short course" theory is therefore required. It is generally agreed that there was a wall on the line of the present northern wall in Roman times, but the question how early in the Roman period it existed remains. SIMONS, with characteristic caution, judges that the Tower of Psephinus probably stood at the angle now occupied by the "Castle of Goliath". The evidence of HAMILTON's soundings at the Damascus Gate and west of Herod's Gate is regarded as ambiguous, and HAMILTON's own interpretation is questioned. SIMONS concludes that the ROBINSON-SUKENIK wall was probably built in the period of Aelia Capitolina, though it remains an enigma.

Occasionally, without of course affecting the force of his arguments, SIMONS' allusions to the present situation in Jerusalem are somewhat antiquated. The synagogues of the Old City, which he says prevent an underground examination of the promontory of the western hill, are now gone, and the quarter is crowded with refugees. The dense occupation of

the Jewish and Armenian quarters, mentioned as making extensive soundings across the western hill unlikely, is now largely an occupation by refugees. Excavation remains as impracticable as ever.

In his thorough consideration of previous literature SIMONS incidentally rescues from oblivion certain studies by the present reviewer. In so doing, he repeatedly criticizes my method on the ground that I considered only Nehemiah's texts and ignored pertinent archeological data. Objection is made also to my attempt to exploit the data of Nehemiah on the basis of both the one-hill and the two-hill theory. If a word of explanation is permissible, my purpose was to test the two theories by the data of Nehemiah. It was methodologically requisite to examine the literary and archeological data separately, and each body of literary data by itself. My results were therefore inconclusive on principle.

A few minor infelicities of language appear in the book, but they are not serious ¹). There are very few misprints ²). Not the least valuable feature of the work is the abundance of excellent maps and plans, many of them otherwise accessible only with some difficulty. The lack of page references where they are referred to is often inconvenient; one must keep turning back to the table of contents to locate them. Photographs of eminent explorers and excavators add an interesting human touch. The book will be very useful as an album and atlas, as well as an authoritative text. Reading it, I often wished that I could have had it with me when I was studying these problems on the ground, though it is so large and heavy that I should almost have needed a donkey or a *ḥammāl* to carry it.

New Haven, October 1954

MILLAR BURROWS

Lachish III: The Iron Age, by Olga TUFNELL, with contributions by Margaret A. MURRAY and David DIRINGER. London, Oxford University Press, 1953. Text Volume, 437 pp. with 37 figures; Plate Volume, 130 plates of photographs, drawing and plans, with descriptions on facing pages.

The biblical Lachish was first identified with the Judean mound of Telled-Duweir by W. F. ALBRIGHT some thirty years ago ³). Before that time a location seven miles west of Duweir at the mound of Tell el-Ḥesi, first proposed by C. R. CONDER in 1878, had been well publicized and accepted as a result of PETRIE's excavations in 1890. The difficulty with Tell el-Ḥesi, however, is that during the Iron Age its occupation was so small that it could scarcely represent a city of major importance such as Lachish must have been. Tell ed-Duweir, on the other hand, not only

¹) With a view to possible correction in future editions one may mention "not too great to exclude" (p. 148); "it [the synagogue of the Theodotus inscription] founded his ancestors" (p. 25—a case of translation English); "concluding to this translation" (p. 172, n. 2); "disorderly piled" (p. 198).

²) I note 1946 for 1936 (p. 161, n. 3) and "design as" for "design a" (p. 365). It is also somewhat disconcerting to find the cross reference "pp. 000" (p. 264).

³) Cf. *ZAW* XLVII, p. 3, note 2.

fits the topographical requirements much better but is a mound of exceptional size with very important Iron Age installations. Indeed, the 18 acres of its summit would lead us to rank it among the most important sites of ancient Palestine, comparable in size to Gezer but larger than Megiddo (13 acres) or even ancient Jerusalem (ca. 11½ acres). Its ruins together with its position in the Shephelah indicate that between the 9th and 6th centuries it was evidently considered a key site in the Judean defense system, dominating the smaller cities of Judeideh (Moresheh-gath) and Sandahannah (Mareshah) by the main pass leading to Hebron.

The tell was excavated in successive seasons between 1932 and 1938 by a British expedition directed by J. L. STARKEY. It was one of the best organized and conducted excavations of modern Palestine but it was brought to a sudden end by the murder of the director during the season of 1938. Before his untimely death STARKEY had been able to witness the publication of the first volume of the expedition's discoveries. That was the well-known *Lachish I: The Lachish Letters* (1938). Since that time Miss Olga TUFNELL, a member of the staff, has been preparing the remainder of the material for publication. In 1940 the remains of a Late Bronze Temple on the northwest slope of the mound were published in *Lachish II: The Fosse Temple* (by Olga TUFNELL, Charles H. INGE and LANCASTER HARDING). *Lachish III* (1953) deals with the Iron, Persian and some later remains, while *Lachish IV*, now in preparation, will conclude with the discoveries from the Bronze Age.

Miss TUFNELL has been working under severe difficulty, largely because stratigraphical excavation of the mound itself was only barely begun by 1938. Most of the work until that time had been preparatory. The northeast, northwest and south slopes had been cleared for the disposal of debris, a work which brought to light the Canaanite temple mentioned above and a large number of tombs. In addition, the lines of fortifications had been followed; the main city gate along the west side and the approaches to it inside and outside the walls had been cleared to Stratum III; the palace-citadel was partially investigated and a large hollow which turned out to be a Judean quarry for building stone had been excavated.

Nine occupational levels have been identified, the lowest belonging to Early Bronze III in the middle of the third millennium when the city was presumably founded. The first five are described in the present volume; the remaining four are left to *Lachish IV*. The most severe destruction suffered by the site before the time of Nebuchadnezzar was that which brought to an end the Late Bronze Age City (Stratum VI) with its temple. A thick burned layer of charcoal and ash covered it wherever its debris was exposed along the mound's edges. A discussion of the date of this destruction must await the evidence presented in the forthcoming volume, though it is already certain that the event occurred toward the end of the 13th century (or at the latest in the beginning of the 12th).

Unlike the Canaanite cities at Tell Beit Mirsim (Debir?) and Tell er-Rumeilan (Beth-shemesh) which were promptly reoccupied by the invading Israelites after destruction, Lachish appears to have been virtually deserted during the 12th and 11th centuries, judging from present evidence. Level

V is clearly the post-Philistine phase of Iron I and to be dated in the 10th century. At this time not far from the city gate in the west-central portion of the mound the ruins of a Bronze Age palace were enclosed in a solid platform, with earthfilled interior, still standing to a considerable height. On this podium, 32 m. square, an Israelite palace was presumably erected, though no part of the brick superstructure now remains intact. This citadel with its platform is probably an archaeological illustration of David's *millo* ("filling"?) in Jerusalem (2 Sam. v 9) and approximately contemporary with it. Adjacent to it was a thick-walled brick building with long parallel rooms which STARKEY happily named the "government storehouse." ALBRIGHT has identified this type of structure in Palestine, found elsewhere at Jericho, Tell Beit Mirsim, Tell en-Nasbeh and Tell er-Rumeilah, with the Hebrew **miskanet*, or granary¹). A very close parallel to the Lachish installations, and one much better preserved, was observed by the writer in the ruins of Tell er-Rumeileh (Beth-shemesh), the town which guarded the Valley of Sorek (Wadi eş-Şarar), some 15 miles north of Duweir. There, too, the palace, though unexcavated, was evidently erected on a podium and near it were the thick stone-foundations of a long-roomed storehouse. The Beth-shemesh granary can be dated no later than the first half of the tenth century and is probably Davidic. Presumably Level V of Lachish was established at the same time²).

No evidence of city fortification was discovered in Level V. The palace may have been enclosed by a strong brick wall, remains of which were found, but further excavation is needed in the area to clarify the matter. The dating of Level IV cannot be established stratigraphically since no work was done within it, and no architectural remains can as yet be ascribed definitely to it. The dividing point between it and V is presumed by the excavators to be the Shishak invasion (*ca.* 918 B.C., ALBRIGHT), and to the same era the main Iron Age fortifications of the mound are ascribed (*cf.* 2 Chron. xi 5-12, where Lachish is listed among the cities fortified by Rehoboam). Around the summit a brick wall, 6 m. wide, was erected with alternating salients and recessed panels of *ca.* 4 m. and 14 m. length respectively. Some 16.5 m. below this around the slope of the mound was a stone and brick revetment some 4 m. wide, with projecting and recessed panels alternating, each about 10 m. wide, except where the wall turned around the tell's corners. At these places an irregular series of recesses and salients replaced the panelling. In other words, the main wall at the summit was provided, by means of the salients, with a regular series of defense towers, while the lower wall had such towers only at the places where maximum protection was necessary. The masses of charcoal found around the bases of the walls may have come from the projecting battlements, undoubtedly built of wood, which are shown on the Lachish relief of Sennacherib.

¹) See *AASOR*, Vols. XXI-XXII, paragraph 10.

²) *Cf.* the writer's description of Level IIa at Beth-shemesh in GRANT and WRIGHT, *Ain Shems Excavations*, Part V, 1939.

Sometime during the late 10th or 9th centuries the 10th century podium of the palace (Palace A) was enlarged by an addition which lengthened the whole from 32 to 78 m. (Palace B). Subsequent to that a 3 m. strip along the east side was added (Palace C). None of these building phases can be closely dated. A series of ten steps leading up to a porch on the east side of the last phase was discovered in excellent condition, buried under a mass of brick fallen from the superstructure. Though these steps were made of the very soft *howr* (a yellow chalky marl) of the neighborhood, there was no evidence that they had ever been scratched or worn. The presumption, therefore, is that the steps were completed only a short time before the final destruction of the building, and this is supported by the presence of a pile of *howr* chips. Below this last flight of stairs were the remains of two earlier stairways. On the lowest, near the outer corner of one of the two preserved steps, the first five letters of the Hebrew alphabet were found to have been scratched. Until the recent discovery at Ras Shamra, these letters were the earliest archaeological evidence for the conventional order of the alphabet. Both DIRINGER and ALBRIGHT agree that, palaeographically, the letters should be dated from the late 9th or early 8th century. All three stairways were built against Phase C of the palace, which would mean that both phases B and C were erected before ca. 925 and 750 B.C.

The major critical problem in *Lachish III* for the archaeologist is the dating of the destruction of Level III. At that time the palace is said to have been completely demolished. Judging from the distribution of the charred debris, it was burned from the inside and the brick walls overthrown by extraction of stones supporting them from beneath. In the debris of burnt brick which spread around the structure huts attributed to Level II were built. The brick wall around the summit was so damaged in the III destruction, at least near the gate, that it was evidently pulled down in this area to a height of 2.5 m. and in Level II a thinner stone wall, ca. 3.70 m. wide, was built upon it. In III the main gate was set in the brick wall at the mound's southwest corner. Outside of it a large bastion ca. 26 × 27.5 m. in size was erected to protect it and this may be the isolated tower, low on the slope, which is shown on the Sennacherib bas-relief. In Level II a more complicated gateway, with indirect access, was evidently built across the bastion, the latter being reused only in part. The outer gate in the revetment was connected with the inner gate at the summit and a series of guardrooms installed (in one of which eighteen of the Lachish Letters were found). In other words, the destruction of III was sufficiently severe that in City II the fortifications had to be reconstructed, at least in part, but the palace was so thoroughly demolished that no attempt was made to rebuild it. Stone for the reconstruction of the wall was evidently quarried from the deep shaft at the southeast corner of the mound's summit. During excavation this shaft was thought to be like those at Gezer and Megiddo which were for the purpose of bringing water within the walls, but the detailed examination of the large pit seems not to have confirmed this conclusion.

STARKEY originally thought that the destructions of III and II were those of Nebuchadnezzar in 598 and 587 B.C. respectively. In *Lachish III* Miss

TUFNELL believes that the differences in ceramics which she observes between Levels III and II mean that a longer interval must separate them. Accordingly, she attributes the destruction of III to Sennacherib in 701 B.C., though at no point does she present detailed arguments as to why she believes this to be so. This reviewer believes that the evidence as published does not sustain her opinion but suggests that STARKEY was correct in the first place ¹).

1. For one thing, the reviewer with the aid of his student, Mr. Lawrence SINCLAIR, has attempted to reconstruct the assemblage of pottery in all stratified loci from Levels III and II, so far as this can be done from the publication. Presumably in order to keep expenses as low as possible, the pottery is published by types and not by groups as it was discovered. This was also done in the Megiddo publications, and this writer still feels that it is a mistake because the necessary schematization prevents the detailed, critical analysis of conclusions. Nevertheless, as far as stratified assemblages can be reconstructed, the reviewer can see no marked differences between the pottery of III and II, once allowances have been made for a number of clear intrusions of Persian forms of Level I into II. Both appear to belong to the seventh or early sixth century.

Clear groups of eighth century pottery appear to me to have been discovered in the upper levels of Tomb 1002 and in the ossuary Tomb 120 and associated pits (Nos. 107, 108, 116, 117). The pottery in these tombs, I would suggest, is earlier than that in the houses of both Levels III and II with which the forms of the seventh or early sixth century Tomb 106 are closely associated.

The problem of the ossuary Tomb 120 and neighbouring pits is an interesting one. They were filled with a conglomeration of bones. The main tomb held the remains of at least 1500 bodies, but the bones were in such a jumbled mass that no order could be discerned. The skulls, separated from the vertebrae, had rolled to the sides of the chamber from the top of the pile. Some of the bones and skulls showed signs of having been burned, and it is clear that the remains had been gathered up from some other area and thrown into this repository after the flesh had decomposed or been burned. Over the solid mass of human bones and spilling over into adjoining pits was a layer of animal bones, most of which were from pigs! A large proportion of the pottery was in broken fragments, some types of which are common in house ruins but rare in tombs. In other words, this deposit was no ordinary cemetery but a place where bones were cast after having been swept up along with pieces of pottery in some other quarter of the town. The human bodies were cared for first, and after them the animal remains (or perhaps the garbage).

STARKEY originally suggested that the deposit represented the clearance of the city after the siege of Sennacherib in 701 B.C., and this explanation has much to commend it. It would explain the conglomerate nature of the deposit, the evidence of burning on some of the bones, and also the fact

¹) So also ALBRIGHT, *BASOR*, No. 132, p. 46; and B. W. BUCHANAN, *American Journal of Archaeology*, Vol. 58 (1954), pp. 335-39.



that few of the people here buried were aged. Miss TUFNELL suggests as an alternate view that the tomb "might have been caused by a wholesale clearance of idolatrous burials during the religious reformation of Josiah" in 621 B.C. Yet against this suggestion is not only the ceramic evidence but also the statement of the expert, D. L. RISON, who studied the bones. He said that the skeletons were "considerably younger than such as is normally found in ancient or recent cemeteries." Furthermore, "the hypothesis that the bones were cleared from an existing cemetery is . . . unacceptable, both because of the lack of aged people and the high proportion of immature skeletons which are normally too easily damaged to survive more than one removal" (*Lachish III*, p. 63).

A further interesting fact is that at least three of the skulls show evidence of the operation known as trepanning (sawing a hole in the skull to relieve pressure on the brain). They are the first specimens found in Western Asia which show this operation. The presence of so many pig bones in the pits is surprising in view of the Israelite dietary laws. It is not impossible that the Lachish pigs were brought there as a part of the commissary of the Assyrian army. No other Israelite town has thus far revealed such a deposit.

2. In studying the royal stamped jar handles from Lachish, of which some 300 were found, David DIRINGER made an important contribution to our knowledge of the subject. Stylistically and epigraphically he divided the stamps into three groups. Class *i* with the four-winged flying scarabeus must be dated in the eighth century. Class *ii* which has a very stylized version of the flying scarab is dated from the late eighth or early seventh centuries. Class *iii* has a two-winged symbol, now generally interpreted as a flying scroll. DIRINGER dates this to the late seventh or early sixth century, suggesting the Josianic reform as the possible occasion for the introduction of the new symbol¹).

In the stratified loci from Levels III and II as published, examples of all three classes appear in each level. This mixture of sherds would be expected if Level III suffered destruction in 598 B.C. but one would not expect to find several specimens of class *iii* in Level III, if Miss TUFNELL were correct in dating the destruction of III in 701 B.C. She argues (p. 45) that a majority of all stamps found belong to class *ii*, which suggests a date for the destruction of Level III in 701 B.C. rather than over a century later. Yet the city was occupied during that remaining Pre-Exilic century, and it is doubtful that the destruction of Level III could possibly explain the predominance of one group over another. I myself would prefer to abide by the results of clearly *stratified* deposits which suggest a great mixture in both III and II.

3. In *Lachish I* eighteen of the ostraca found in a guardroom of the gate were published. In the last campaign during the season of 1938 three more were discovered. Number XIX appeared in the burned debris of the roadway. On the east side of Palace C a row of rooms was built on the burned-brick debris of the Palace walls. These rooms were thus ascribed to Level II.

¹) *Lachish III*, pp. 342-344; *PEQ*, 1941, pp. 99-101; *Biblical Archaeologist*, Vol. XII, No. 4 (Dec. 1949), pp. 70-86. Cf. W. F. ALBRIGHT, *AASOR*, Vols. XXI-XXII (1943), pp. 74 f.

In one of them ostrakon No. XX was discovered, while *below the floor* of the same room ostrakon No. XXI was found with a large storage jar on top of it. Little can be read on No. XX except the date-formula, "In the ninth year," which for ALBRIGHT and GINSBERG suggests the date of the other letters found earlier (i.e., the ninth year of Zedekiah). No. XXI below the floor would be earlier, at least stratigraphically, and GINSBERG remarks that it "alone among all the Lachish ostraca (except perhaps No. XIX) antedates the reign of Zedekiah." Miss TUFNELL (p. 57) remarks that ostrakon XIX is inscribed in an earlier epigraphic style, one which was perhaps current at the time when Level III was burned; and she seems to imply the same for No. XXI. Stratigraphically, one would suppose that No. XXI should belong with the debris of Level III. Yet if the destruction of City III is dated in 701 B.C., the epigraphy of ostrakon XXI (and also XIX) should show more differences from that of the other ostraca than is the case.

4. Finally, if Level III were destroyed as early as the time of Hezekiah, it is queer that the Palace was not rebuilt in the intervening century before the destruction of Level II. Furthermore, the history of the great shaft needs adequate explanation. It was a large excavation ($22 \times 25.20 \times 25.50$ m.) from which 14,285 cubic meters of solid rock had been removed. The sherds found at the lowest point of the debris date from the end of the city's Pre-Exilic history; whereas the contents of the debris above indicate that the shaft was allowed to fill up rapidly from town drainage after 588-7 B.C. Miss TUFNELL says (p. 162) that "there is some indication that the great areas of plastered court surrounding the citadel were constructed from small rock chips overlaid with crushed chalk, which may well have come from the cutting of the Great Shaft. The plastered areas are largely associated with Level III, which was terminated, according to the present view, by Sennacherib's destruction in 700 B.C. Wherever the plaster surface was undisturbed by the cutting of later pits, it remained in good condition and showed little signs of wear. Therefore it does not appear likely that it was in use for long before its destruction." She then goes on to associate the shaft with the measures which Hezekiah took in Jerusalem to insure water supply during a siege, and this "would account for the short period of use of the plastered courts."

Yet if the shaft were dug during Hezekiah's reign, then far more Pre-Exilic pottery should have been found in the bottom of it than was discovered. I would suggest that the primary purpose of the shaft had nothing to do with the city's water supply. Had it been intended to be a huge cistern, it would surely have been constructed as such with an underground chamber and small opening which could be capped to protect the interior from silt. Instead, the shaft was probably simply a quarry for the stone needed to rebuild the inner wall around the summit at the end of the seventh or early sixth century, and perhaps also for the repair of the palace-citadel and its courts.

Our contention is thus that the destructions of Levels III and II are best explained as those of Nebuchadnezzar in 598 and 587 respectively, though the stratigraphical examination of the mound is insufficiently advanced

to permit clear-cut demarcation of all features of the city's history during its final Pre-Exilic days, especially as regards the history of Level III.

Level I is clearly post-Exilic. After a long period during which the mound was virtually abandoned, a new residency was erected on the podium of the pre-Exilic palace-citadel. It was a large structure—in plan a series of rooms erected around an open court—and it is comparable to a contemporary building found by PETRIE at Tell Jemmeh (*Gerar*, Pl. XI) and to slightly earlier structures at Megiddo (JAMON and SHIPTON, *Megiddo I*, pp. 69-72 and Fig. 89). Within the residency a large number of imported attic sherds were discovered, and these are dated from the mid-fifth to the mid-fourth century B.C. In other words, the Post-Exilic occupation of Lachish seems to have occurred during the fifth century and like Megiddo virtually to have ceased during the fourth century. During this time the Pre-Exilic walls and gate were reconstructed, and a small temple (called a "Solar Shrine" for reasons not particularly convincing) probably erected. Pottery and coins belonging to the last phase of the temple are dated in the latter half of the second century, indicating that this building remained in use after the main reoccupation of the mound had ceased and the district center had shifted from Lachish to Tell Sandahannah (Mareshah), $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles northeast. Scattered coins of later periods appeared, and a portion of the Roman road (3rd-5th centuries, A.D.) from Beit Jibrin past Roman Lachish (Khirbet Duweir, 1100 m. southeast) to Gaza was excavated. It was along this road without doubt that Eusebius noted the position of *Lakeis* in his *Onomasticon*.

In the description of the objects found the following may be especially noted: 1) DIRINGER's new discussion of the Lachish Letters in the light of scholarly study since their first publication (pp. 331-339) and his equally welcome study of the jar stamps, seals and weights. 2) Belonging to Level I were fragments of a large number of crude incense altars, made of soft limestone. They are generally cuboid in shape, stand on four short legs and have a shallow trough on top. The sides are decorated with incised geometric designs and portrayals of desert flora and fauna. Other examples have been found in southern Palestine at Gezer and Tell Jemmeh, and the type is similar to those found in southern Arabia by Miss G. CATON-THOMPSON and the American Foundation for the Study of Man. One of them found by Miss THOMPSON contained the remains of a fragrant resinous substance, and others, dated by A. JAMME between the seventh-sixth and third centuries B.C., have been found inscribed with the names of different kinds of incense. The altars certainly illustrate the trade relations between South Arabia and southern Palestine in the time of Nehemiah and Gashmu the Arab (Neh. vi 1)¹). One of the Lachish altars bears a three-line inscription in Aramaic. A. DUPONT-SOMMER's decipherment and interpretation of this inscription (*Lachish III*, pp. 358-9) scarcely commends

¹) See K. GALLING, *ZDPV* 52 (1929), pp. 246 ff.; G. CATON-THOMPSON, *The Tombs and Moon Temple of Hureidha (Hadbramaut)*, 1944; W. F. ALBRIGHT, *BASOR*, No. 98, p. 28.

itself from the meaning made out of the words. W. F. ALBRIGHT's revised reading at least makes better sense (*BASOR*, No. 132, p. 47).

Considering the unfinished nature of the excavation, it is indeed astonishing what a wealth of important material was recovered from the ruins of Tell ed-Duweir. Miss TUFNELL must receive our gratitude for her diligent work, amidst great difficulties, in presenting and interpreting the scattered remains from what must have been very incomplete field notes and records.

Chicago, Illinois

G. ERNEST WRIGHT

The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes. New Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls. By André DUPONT-SOMMER. Translated from the French by Richard David BARNETT (Vallentine, Mitchell & Co; London 1954; XII and 195 pages; 10/6).

Professor André DUPONT-SOMMER's book, first published under the title *Nouveaux aperçus sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte*, contains a series of studies and articles written after the publication of the author's important *Aperçus Préliminaires*. The names of the author, who is Professor of ancient Semitic languages in the Faculty of Arts of the Sorbonne and Director of Studies in the École des Hautes Études, and of the translator, Deputy Keeper in the Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities of the British Museum, guarantee the high scholarly standard of the work. It is no disparagement of its value to say that the book hardly raises any new points in the field of its investigation; it merely surveys the ground in an effort to support and re-enforce the arguments put forward in DUPONT-SOMMER's earlier work.

The present volume contains nine chapters and a postscript. The first chapter and postscript are more or less reports on the excavations that have been going on in the Judean desert from 1947 to 1952; the second chapter is concerned with the period of the composition of the Habbaquq Commentary; chapter three investigates connections between the Testament of Levi and the literature of the Qumrân community; chapters four to eight deal in detail with the Manual of Discipline; chapter nine considers the impact of Essenism on Jesus of Nazareth and his followers. Though DUPONT-SOMMER is a scholar of rank, not all chapters of his book are of equal value.

The reviewer is not qualified to offer an opinion on the question as to whom the expression "Kittim" (or *Kittîm*) in the Habbaquq Commentary refers; while Professor ROWLEY understands it to be a reference to the Seleucid rulers of Syria¹) (and therefore places the Commentary in the beginning of the second century B.C.E.), DUPONT-SOMMER thinks that the Romans are meant (and dates the Commentary after the year 63 B.C.E.). The argument of DUPONT-SOMMER is a strong one. Yet even if it is accepted,

¹) "The Covenanters of Damascus and the Dead Sea Scrolls", *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* XXXV No. 1, pp. 111-154, on pp. 133, 139-141 and in footnote 1 on p. 145.

as indeed most scholars have accepted it¹), it would not prejudice the date of origin of the Dead Sea Scrolls on the whole²). On this problem DUPONT-SOMMER states: "The sect of the Covenant, already founded in the second century B.C., reached its full expansion in the first century B.C., thanks to the vigorous impulse given it by the Teacher of Righteousness. The Habakkuk Commentary, the Manual of Discipline, the Damascus Document belong to this period" (p. 162). This chronology raises difficulties. In the Damascus Document, one of the latest writings of the sect, whose author must therefore be assumed to have been acquainted with the past history of the community of which he was a member, we read in i 6 (col. I, lines 8, 9) that "the blind" (i.e. the Jewish people of that age) had been "groping for the way" (i.e. embracing the teachings of the Covenanters) for 20 years before the appearance of the *moreh sedeq*. If this is understood, as it commonly is, in the sense that the sect that produced the Dead Sea Scrolls and the so-called Šadoqite Fragments had been in existence for just 20 years before the appearance of the Teacher of Righteousness, it would—on the basis of DUPONT-SOMMER's chronology—put the foundation of the Qumrân community in the nineties or eighties of the first pre-Christian century. But this contrasts with DUPONT-SOMMER's view that the sect was founded in the second pre-Christian century and makes it impossible to identify the Qumrân community with the Ḥassidim of pre-Maccabaeen and Maccabaeen days, an identification which DUPONT-SOMMER elsewhere makes (pp. 70, 72, 129, 130, 132). If further the Essene community was "fully constituted and fully adult" (p. 162) already in the second pre-Christian century, one would expect them to possess a literary document in which the rules were set out by which members of the community were bound; if the Manual of Discipline was composed only after the year 63 B.C.E., one would have to suppose that it merely superseded an older set of rules that were in force from the time of the sect's very beginnings³).

DUPONT-SOMMER connects the Psalms of Solomon with the Qumrân community (pp. 38, 50). There is great similarity between the description

¹) The identity of the *Kittiim* appears to Dr. J. L. TEICHER as a matter about which no doubt could possibly exist: "*The Kitti'm in the Habakkuk Scroll are, obviously, Romans*"; see "The Dead Sea Scrolls — Documents of the Jewish-Christian Sect of Ebionites" (*Journal of Jewish Studies* II No. 2, pp. 67-99, on p. 98).

²) The *Kittiyyē 'Aššūr* and *Kittiyyē Mišrayim* in the scroll of The Wars of the Children of Light against the Children of Darkness refer indubitably to Seleucid Syria and Ptolemaic Egypt, respectively. If in the Habakkuk Commentary the expression was used of the Romans, this would only indicate that that particular work comes from a comparatively later age.

³) Bo REICKE, in „Die Ta'āmire-Schriften und die Damaskus Fragmente" (*Studia Theologica* II No. 1, pp. 45-70) rightly pointed out of the Manual: *Der Text enthält die Gemeindeordnung der Sekte*, and he suggested to give it the title *Constitutiones Ta'āmire* (on pp. 47, 48).

See also the thorough and persuasive exposition by Isaac RABINOWITZ, "Sequence and Dates of the Extra-Biblical Dead Sea Scroll Texts and 'Damascus' Fragments" (*Vetus Testamentum* III No. 2, pp. 174-185), stating reasons for dating the Manual of Discipline in the years 175-167 B.C.E.

of the evils of the age in the Habacquq Commentary and in the Psalms of Solomon¹), and scholars agree that these psalms were written at the time which DUPONT-SOMMER would like to assign to the death of the *moreh sedeq*. Yet the author overlooks the fact that the messianology of the Psalms of Solomon is far more advanced and specific than the vague references to a messiah, or two messiahs, that occur in the Manual of Discipline (? and the Book of the Damascus Covenanters). The messianology of the Psalms of Solomon is pharisaic in character. It is a "Son-of-David" messianology that is also found in the Shmonch Esreh and in some of the oldest strata of the Synoptic Gospels that connect the evangelical with pharisaic traditions. The messianology of the Dead Sea Documents envisages no Davidic ruler (messiah). In fact, the comparison with the Psalms of Solomon does more harm than good to the theory. It appears that the Manual of Discipline and the Damascus Document were composed before disillusion with the Hasmonaean dynasty had set in.

An interesting line of discussion of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs has been revived by DUPONT-SOMMER by connecting them with the documents of the Qumrân sect²). There may well be points of contact. In the Testament of Levi xvi 3 we find a mysterious reference to the death of a "man who renews the Law in the power of the Most High". This *could* refer to the *moreh sedeq*—but it would not solve for us the problem concerning the time in which the latter lived. DUPONT-SOMMER's investigation into the relationship between the documents found at 'Ain Feshkha and the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs is not comprehensive enough to allow reasonable deductions. True, there is in the Manual of Discipline iii 14-iv 26 and in the Testament of Asher i 3-v 2³) a striking affinity in the teaching of the Two Ways. However, the question would have to be studied if the similarity were close enough to assume that both documents had emanated from the same group or sect; variations of the theme may well have been current amongst adherents of different sects within Judaism. Just to show how involved this problem really is: early Christian documents which manifestly made use of Jewish sources, such as the Didache, the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas, also expound the teaching

¹) See Hans-Joachim SCHOEPS: "Handelt es sich wirklich um ebionitische Dokumente?" (*Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* III No. 4, pp. 322-336), on pp. 328-331.

²) Salomo SCHECHTER noticed the affinity of the *Fragments of a Zadokite Work* (Cambridge 1910) with the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Hugo GRESSMANN, in his review of the *editio princeps* (*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* LXVI No. 3, pp. 491-503), found additional resemblances and parallelisms. Eduard MEYER proceeded in *Die Gemeinde des Neuen Bundes im Lande Damaskus. Eine jüdische Schrift aus der Seleukidenzeit* (*Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Klasse*, Jahrg. 1919 No. 9) to determine the time of the composition of the Testaments from indications given in the Book of the New Covenanters. All these scholars noted the kindred spirit and various external points of contact between the two writings.

³) The numerals indicate in the first case columns and lines; in the second case chapters and verses.

of the Two Ways. This could be interpreted as lending support to Dr. J. L. TEICHER's adamant assertion that the Dead Sea Scrolls were Judaeo-Christian writings. Yet obviously, the theories of DUPONT-SOMMER and of TEICHER are mutually exclusive. The question of the relationship of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs to the Manual of Discipline requires a more close examination than that accorded to it so far.

Robert Henry CHARLES, in his edition of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, admitted with the honesty of scholarship that the beginning lines of Test. Levi xvii were "unintelligible" to him. DUPONT-SOMMER tries to make them intelligible and he explains that it was the Hasmonaeen dynasty who were meant by the seven high-priests of that passage; in order to do so, and to obtain the number seven, he makes Judas Macabaeus a high-priest which he was not, and he omits Alexander who was one (pp. 43-46). Indefensible is DUPONT-SOMMER's treatment of certain passages from the Testament of Levi. He brackets in Test. Levi xviii 7 the words "in the water" (p. 41), indicating thus that he considers them to be a Christian interpolation. If it is admitted that the chapter contains interpolations, the suspicion is that the words in verse 7 will not be the only interpolated passage. It is therefore surprising to see that the author does not also bracket the passage following after the words "And in his priesthood the Gentiles shall be multiplied in knowledge", i.e. "but Israel shall be minished through ignorance and darkened through grief" in Test. Levi xviii 9—obviously a later addition. In Test. Levi x 2 the words "against the Saviour of the world, Christ, acting godlessly" are bracketed (p. 47), but in Test. Levi xiv 2 the line "who (i.e. the chief priests) will lay their hands upon the Saviour of the world" which come manifestly from the same hand as the interpolation in x 2 are considered genuine (p. 47). This attitude is inconsistent.

It cannot be overlooked that the *Textus Receptus* of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs teems with second century (and later) interpolations¹); to quote only a few: T Sim. vi 7, T Dan. vi 9, T Jos. xix 11, T Ben. iii 8. Test. Ben. ix 3-5 contains a complete prediction of Jesus' crucifixion, his descent to Hades, and his ascension. We do not know in what manner the *moreh sedeq* met his death; but surely he was not crucified. To take isolated references to the *sôtêr tou kosmou* in the extant text of the Testaments as references to the *moreh sedeq* is uncritical. In the N.T. the term appears only in hellenistic strata. In the elation of victory over the national enemy a Jewish writer might occasionally have attributed the title "saviour of Israel" to a hero or liberator, but in the sphere of religious thinking no such or even more exalted title would have been bestowed by Jews upon any man. Are we really free to assume that a Jew who composed the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs either had never read Deut. xxxiii 29, 2 Sam. vii 23, Isa. xliii 3, 11, xlv 15, 17, 21, lii 9-10, lx 16, lxiii 8

¹) These interpolations are so frequent that DE JONGE in *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Manchester 1954) has unearthed the claim that the work is entirely a second or third century Christian composition which merely made use of some older Jewish material.

(comp. also Isa. xlv 6, 8, 23, xlv 4, xlvii 4, xlviii 20, xlix 7, li 6 *etc.*) or that having read them he wished to lodge objection to the idea expressed therein? Could the member of a sect that is known to have treasured Isaiah, a man who read in Isa. xliii 11 the words

אנכי יהוה
ואין מבלעדי מושיע

be credited with the intention to call the Teacher of Righteousness "saviour of the world"? The jubilant exclamation of Isaiah of the Exile וְגֵאֲלָךְ קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל - אֱלֹהֵי כָל-הָאָרֶץ יִקְרָא (liv 5) is echoed in the solemn announcement of Isaiah of the Return כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה מוֹשִׁיעַךְ וְגֵאֲלָךְ אֲבִיר יַעֲקֹב

(lx 16), and the same sentiment pervades the concluding Isaian chapters. Before we read the Testaments and draw any deductions from the received text as to the author of particular passages, we must remember this. Any and all passages in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs where *ho sōtēr tou kosmou* is mentioned are Christian interpolations, i.e. Pauline Christian, not Jewish Naṣorean. No Jew, not even a messianist Jew, not even a messianist Jew who identified the eschatological ruler with either the person of the Teacher of Righteousness (there is no evidence that the Sect of Qumrân did so) or with the person of Jesus of Nazareth, would ever have styled his messiah *mōshi'a ha'ōlam*. Where it is encountered in the N.T., this term is found exclusively in hellenistic strata coloured by Pauline thinking and employing the vocabulary of Paul. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs may not be a Christian work incorporating Jewish sources, as has recently been claimed; they are a Jewish work redressed by successive Christian copyists, yet the additions are substantial and any critic who would from the Testaments draw conclusions as to what Jews believed and how they expressed their beliefs will have to proceed with care.

An extensive section of DUPONT-SOMMER's new book deals with the Manual of Discipline. He admirably succeeds in illuminating the life and religious practices of the Qumrân community from the pages of this significant document. Clear-sighted and excellent also are his expositions on the importance of the documents of the Qumrân community for the understanding of the New Testament ¹). What DUPONT-SOMMER observes on this subject can only be unreservedly quoted: "... a clear connection is to be seen in many respects between the Primitive (Christian) Church and the Jewish community of the Covenant, in its organization, its rites, and its dogmas", "... the influence which the Jewish Sect of the Covenant exerted on nascent Christianity (is) an integral part of the general historical perspective in which the problem of the (Dead Sea) manuscripts (must be viewed)" (pp. 150, 151). "It is quite clear that in future the exegesis of New

¹) Except for a boldly "liberal" and quite unhistorical estimation of the motives behind the activity of the Apostle Paul (on p. 157). — Paul never intended to break away from Judaism; his interpretation of what was important in Jewish religion and what not, differed from that of the Jacobean wing of the messianist movement, yet it was as thoroughly Jewish as any.

Testament passages can no longer dispense with the light that the Hebrew texts of Qumran can throw upon them" (p. 152). Beliefs and practices, dogmas and rituals, of the Qumrân community bear close resemblance to the beliefs and practices of early messianists who grouped themselves around Shimeon Kêpha of Kfar Naḥum and Yaaqobh ḥaṣ-ṣadiq, the "brother of the Lord". It is clear that the beginnings of the gospel of Jesus the Anointed One cannot be satisfactorily "explained" from the platform of rabbinical Judaism, and the more valuable for our historical comprehension of those beginnings is the re-appearance of documents of pre-rabbinical Judaism.

DUPONT-SOMMER's book will be read with profit by scholars and laymen alike. The outward appearance of the book is pleasant except for an excessive amount of misprints.

London

PAUL WINTER

BOOK LIST¹⁾

- The Interpreter's Bible*, Volume 3, Abingdon Press, New York and Nashville, Tennessee U.S.A., 1954. 1198 pp. Price \$ 8.75.
- The King James and Revised Standard Versions with General Articles and Introduction, Exegesis and Exposition. This third Volume of the very practical Series of high standard brings the commentary on Kings (N. H. SNAITH, Introduction and Exegesis); Chronicles (W. A. L. EEMSLIE, Introduction and Exegesis); Ezra and Nehemiah (R. A. BOWMAN, Introduction and Exegesis); Esther (B. W. ANDERSON, Introduction and Exegesis); and Job (S. TERRIEN, Introduction and Exegesis).
- A. ALT, *Die Herkunft der Hyksos in neuer Sicht*, Akademie-Verlag, Berlin 1954. 39 pp. Price: D.M. 2.—
- A. VAN DEN BORN, *Ezechiël uit de grondtekst vertaald en uitgelegd*, Roermond en Maaseik, 1954. 287 pp. Price Dutch florins 10,80.
- J. DE FRAINE, *L'aspect religieux de la royauté israélite*. L'institution monarchique dans l'Ancien Testament et dans les textes mésopotamiens. Roma 1954. xl + 425 pp. Price: It. lire 5.000. \$ 8.50.
- W. H. GISPEN, *Spreeken*, tweede deel (xvi-xxxi), Kok, Kampen 1954. 364 pp.
- N. K. GOTTWALD, *Studies in the Book of Lamentations*, S. C. M. Press, London, 1954, 122 pp. Studies in Biblical Theology No. 14. Price 8/- net.
- Ch.-F. JEAN, *Dictionnaire des inscriptions sémitiques de l'ouest*, Livraison 2, Brill, Leiden 1954, 64 pp. **גר ב - כשתה**.
- W. Brede KRISTENSEN †, *Symbolen en Werkelijkheid*, een bundel godsdiensthistorische studiën, Van Loghum Slaterus, Arnhem 1954. 360 pp. Price Dutch fl. 17,50.
- E. A. LESLIE, *Jeremiah chronologically arranged, translated, and interpreted*, Abingdon Press, New York and Nashville, 1954. 340 pp. Price \$ 4,75.
- A vividly written running commentary on Jeremiah, similar in style and approach to the writer's commentary on the Psalter.
- S. MOWINCKEL, *Der achtundsechzigste Psalm*, Oslo 1953 (1954). 78 pp. Price Norveg. Kr. 7,50.
- R. NORTH, *Sociology of the Biblical Jubilee*, Roma 1954. xlv + 246 pp. Price: It. lire 3.900. \$ 6.50.
- M. NOTH, *Geschichte Israels*, zweite neubearbeitete Auflage, mit Bibelstellerverzeichnis. Göttingen, 1954. 435 pp.
- J. B. PRITCHARD, *The Ancient Near East in Pictures*, relating to the Old Testament, Princeton, N. J., 1954. 770 illustrations.
- R. RENDTORFF, *Die Gesetze in der Priesterschrift*. Eine gattungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung. Berlin 1954. 88 pp. Price D.M. 6,80.
- Edw. ROBERTSON, *The John Rylands Library, Manchester*. A brief descriptive account. Manchester 1954. 32 pp. With many excellent illustrations. Price 1 sh.
- A. SCHWARZENBACH, *Die geographische Terminologie im Hebräischen des Alten Testaments*, Brill, Leiden 1954. xii + 211 pp. Thesis Zürich.
- Eine wichtige lexikographische Arbeit, besonders brauchbar durch die Konkordanz zur alten Versionen, pp. 163-200.

¹⁾ The mention of books in this list neither implies nor precludes subsequent review at length.

- N. H. SNAITH, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of 1 Kings xvii-xix and xxi-xxii*, Epworth Press, London, 1954. 109 pp. Price 10 sh. 6 d.
An excellent text-book for students at the elementary stage. Similar to the writer's earlier commentaries on portions of the Hebrew text. Contains a useful vocabulary.
- F. STIER, *Ijjob, das Buch Hiob Hebräisch und Deutsch, mit Auslegung, Einleitung, Text- und Sacherläuterungen*. Kösel Verlag, München, 1954. 362 pp. D.M. 25.—.
- E. L. SUKENIK †, *אוצר המגילות הנעוות*. Bialek Foundation and Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Isr. 1954. 40 pp. introduction, with illustrations; 59 pp. transcription in Hebrew of the DSS in hands of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, with some illustration; and 58 plates, very well prepared facsimiles of the material. This splendid edition has been published after Professor SUKENIK's death by Dr N. AVIGAD.
- S. TEDESCHE and S. ZEITLIN, *The Second Book of Maccabees*, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1954, xiii + 271 pp. Price \$ 4.00.
English translation by S. TEDESCHE, Introduction, Commentary and Edition of the Greek text by S. ZEITLIN. Series: Jewish Apocryphal Literature, Dropsie College Edition.
- Ch. C. TORREY, *The Chronicler's History of Israel*, Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah restored to its original form. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1954. xxxiv + 207 pp. Price \$ 5.00.
The Hebrew text is of BAER's edition. The Author's principle of edition, already worked out in his former studies, *The Composition and Historical Value of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah*, 1896, and *Ezra Studies*, 1910, is Chronicler's authorship of the entire story of the three books. The author of the story is a novelist, writing an edifying fiction.
- H. W. WOLFF, *Eine Handbreit Erde*. Kleines Palästinatagebuch, Luther Verlag, Witten Ruhr 1954. D.M. 3,50.
- W. ZIMMERLI, *Erkenntnis Gottes nach dem Buche Ezechiel*, Zwingli Verlag, Zürich 1954. 75 pp. D.M. 8,50.
- Bijbels Woordenboek*, ed. A. VAN DEN BORN a. o., 2d ed., part I, Aalmoes-Egypte. Roermond en Maaseik, 1954. 413 pp.
This Bible-Encyclopaedia will be complete in 4 parts. Text, maps and illustrations are very useful and up to date. Special attention is paid to Roman Catholic views.

QUELQUES REMARQUES SUR LE *COMMENTAIRE* *D'HABACUC*, À PROPOS D'UN LIVRE RÉCENT

PAR

A. DUPONT-SOMMER

Paris

Le Professeur K. ELLIGER a récemment publié sur le *Commentaire d'Habacuc*, trouvé en 1947 dans la grotte I de Qumrân, un livre entier qui, certainement, représente le travail de beaucoup le plus copieux et, sur certains points, le plus fouillé qu'on ait fait paraître depuis 1950 sur ce rouleau hébreu, si bref, mais si important¹). Ainsi que l'explique l'Avant-propos, l'auteur se proposa d'abord simplement d'examiner dans le document nouveau les variantes du texte biblique d'*Habacuc*; mais cette tâche l'entraîna à étudier le texte tout entier du rouleau, puis les divers problèmes philologiques et historiques que soulève celui-ci. L'ouvrage d'ELLIGER est donc une collection d'études, qui vont en s'élargissant de plus en plus.

Les deux premiers chapitres s'appliquent à combler, à l'aide de conjectures, les diverses lacunes du texte, notamment celles de la colonne II. Le chapitre III compare minutieusement le texte d'*Habacuc* attesté dans le rouleau de Qumrân avec le texte massorétique. Le chapitre IV étudie l'orthographe et les particularités paléographiques du nouveau manuscrit, tandis que le chapitre V est consacré à la langue et au style de l'auteur du *Commentaire*: ELLIGER y montre excellentement à quel point cette langue et ce style sont nourris de réminiscences bibliques. Le chapitre VI définit la méthode exégétique propre au *Commentaire d'Habacuc*: celui-ci, selon ELLIGER, n'est pas essentiellement et spécifiquement un „midrash”, au sens rabbinique du mot, mais un commentaire d'un type spécial, que désigne proprement le mot „peshet”, et qui cherche, à l'aide d'une révélation proprement divine, à découvrir dans les phrases et dans les mots du texte biblique les secrets de la période eschatologique. A la lumière

¹) *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer*, Tübingen 1953 (= *Beiträge zur historischen Theologie*, Bd. 15); XIII — 302 pp., plus un appendice: *Der hebräische Text des Habakuk-Kommentars vom Toten Meer in Umschrift*, 13 pp.

de ces diverses études, en quelque sorte préliminaires, ELLIGER, dans le chapitre VII, présente sa traduction du rouleau entier, accompagnée de notes nombreuses: c'est la partie principale du livre. Les chapitres VIII et IX, enfin, abordent directement l'un les problèmes de datation et d'histoire, l'autre les questions de doctrine.

Toutes ces études, déclare l'auteur, furent préparées au cours de l'année 1951; comme l'impression de l'ouvrage se trouva retardée, elles purent recevoir en 1952 et jusqu'au début de 1953 quelques compléments, mais l'ouvrage, paru vers la fin de 1953, se date en réalité pour le fond de 1951. L'ambition de l'auteur, à cette date, fut, en se limitant à un seul des écrits de Qumrân, de „l'examiner à fond pour lui-même, avant que ne s'affermissent les théories en vogue qui font en partie violence aux textes au lieu de se laisser mesurer à eux en tant qu'hypothèses de travail” (p. 4), bref de présenter une monographie solide, essentiellement analytique, qui inaugurerait l'étude vraiment méthodique et scientifique des nouveaux documents ¹⁾. Chacun de ceux qui, avant ELLIGER, ont peiné de leur mieux dans le champ récemment offert à leurs recherches, alors qu'il était encore totalement indéfriché, sera reconnaissant à notre auteur d'y entrer lui-même à son tour et d'y apporter son concours particulièrement compétent et autorisé. Plus d'un, toutefois, se demandera si, dans une monographie qui veut être vraiment approfondie et équilibrée, le travail d'analyse, incontestablement nécessaire, ne doit pas s'accompagner constamment d'un égal souci de l'ensemble et de la synthèse; si l'étude du *Commentaire d'Habacuc* peut, sans grave danger, laisser systématiquement de côté les autres écrits de la même secte, notamment l'*Ecrit de Damas* et le *Manuel de Discipline*; si, enfin, malgré les risques qu'elle comporte, une méthode plus ouverte, plus souple, plus intuitive, n'est pas, somme toute, mieux adaptée aux conditions présentes du travail scientifique sur les manuscrits et, par conséquent, plus valable.

En fait, l'ouvrage d'ELLIGER n'est pas lui-même exempt d'hypothèses; et il n'est pas sûr que ses interprétations ne fassent pas parfois violence aux textes, autant et plus que les interprétations qu'il critique. C'est à ses prédécesseurs qu'il emprunte plusieurs de ses vues essentielles. Loin donc de marquer un vrai commencement, comme

¹⁾ Cf. p. 4: „... Mit dieser vordringlichen Arbeit wollen die folgenden Studien zum HK einen Anfang machen.” La feuille de librairie reprend ainsi cette phrase: „Die vorliegenden Studien zum HK wollen mit dieser grundlegenden Arbeit einen Anfang machen.”

semble l'indiquer l'auteur, son livre s'insère plutôt, selon nous, dans la série déjà longue des contributions auxquelles les trouvailles de Qumrân ont donné naissance et qui, jusqu'à ce qu'ait été publiée la totalité des documents, doivent toutes être considérées comme de simples travaux d'approche, aux conclusions nécessairement révisables. Nous reconnaissons, toutefois, volontiers que, dans son ensemble, le présent ouvrage représente un effort particulièrement attentif et vigoureux pour éclairer le texte du petit écrit hébreu et qu'à ce titre il rendra de grands services, — ne serait-ce qu'en obligeant chacun de ceux qui ont déjà travaillé sur ce document à reconsidérer soigneusement ses propres opinions. C'est ce que nous allons tenter nous-même de faire ici.

I

Prenons d'abord la question, évidemment primordiale, de l'arrière-plan historique du *Commentaire d'Habacuc*. Voici la position d'ELLIGER. Le premier point qu'il met en lumière, c'est que les Kittim que vise et décrit le commentateur sont à identifier avec les Romains. Les traits caractéristiques qui permettent de les reconnaître, déclare-t-il, c'est d'abord qu'„ils viennent de loin, des îles de la mer", et surtout qu'„ils sacrifient à leurs étendards": ces deux traits conviennent parfaitement aux soldats des légions romaines, nullement à ceux des armées syriennes. Ayant proposé et soutenu la thèse romaine depuis 1950 ¹⁾, je ne puis que me réjouir de voir ELLIGER, après un certain nombre d'auteurs, se rallier à cette opinion ²⁾.

¹⁾ Voir *Aperçus préliminaires sur les manuscrits de la mer Morte*, 1950, pp. 40-42; *Nouveaux aperçus ...*, 1953, pp. 33-61.

²⁾ I. RABINOWITZ, dans l'article intitulé: „Sequence and Dates of the Extra-Biblical Dead Sea Scroll Texts and „Damascus Fragments"" (*V. T.* III, 1953, pp. 175-185), a récemment présenté diverses objections contre la thèse romaine. Il remarque notamment (p. 180, n. 2) que la phrase „les Kittim sacrifient à leurs étendards" semble bien au premier abord se référer au culte romain des *signa*; mais, ajoute-t-il, cette phrase peut convenir tout aussi bien, „et peut-être même mieux" (!), aux armées séleucides. En effet, explique-t-il, ces armées avaient, elles aussi, des enseignes; et, d'autre part, on peut admettre que les sacrifices divinatoires y étaient en usage: si bien que, pour l'auteur du *Commentaire d'Habacuc*, „des sacrifices divinatoires à proximité des fanions et des armes entassées peuvent fort bien avoir semblé être les sacrifices d'un culte idolâtre de ces objets". Nul ne nie l'existence d'étendards dans les armées séleucides; mais il s'agit ici d'autre chose: des sacrifices offerts à ces étendards. L'expression du *Commentaire* est parfaitement nette, — exactement semblable à celle qu'emploie Josèphe à propos des Romains (*B. J.*, VI, 6, 1): „Ayant porté leurs étendards dans le Temple ..., ils sacrifièrent à ceux-ci en cet endroit même." Expliquer que l'auteur

Un second point qu'il souligne, et sur lequel je me trouve pleinement d'accord avec lui, c'est que la domination des Kittim (entendons celle des Romains), dans le *Commentaire d'Habacuc*, n'est pas décrite comme un fait à venir, mais comme un fait présent; „l'auteur, dit-il, décrit manifestement ces Kittim non pas seulement de loin et par ouï-dire, mais de très près et par expérience personnelle” (p. 270). Le *terminus a quo* pour la rédaction du *Commentaire*, conclut-il, ne peut donc être que „l'apparition des Romains en Syrie et

de *Commentaire* aurait confondu des sacrifices divinatoires, du fait qu'on les aurait célébrés à proximité des étendards, avec des „sacrifices aux étendards”, c'est prêter gratuitement à cet auteur des facultés d'observation très au-dessous de la normale; peut-on admettre, d'autre part, que, vers 160 avant J.-C., voulant décrire tel usage des armées séleucides, il ait employé les termes exacts qui conviennent typiquement à l'usage des armées romaines? L'explication de RABINOWITZ n'est, en réalité, qu'une échappatoire. — Les autres objections qu'il formule contre la thèse romaine me paraissent tout aussi fragiles. Ne retenons ici que celle-ci (p. 181-182): l'expression dont se sert l'*Écrit de Damas* pour désigner le conquérant étranger „qui est venu pour exercer sur eux (les Juifs impies) la vengeance”, à savoir ראש מלכי יון „le chef des rois de la Grèce” (viii 11, xix 23-24), ne saurait nullement désigner le Romain Pompée, mais seulement un roi séleucide (Antiochus Epiphane). En effet, écrit-il, „le mot ראש signifie „chef” au sens de *primus inter pares*, . . . il ne peut donc ici que se référer à quelqu'un qui était lui-même l'un des „rois de la Grèce”, et Pompée, en définitive, n'était point tel”. Mais il est tout à fait inexact que le mot ראש „chef” ait nécessairement un sens aussi restreint que le prétend RABINOWITZ: de façon générale, il correspond au latin *princeps* ou au grec *ἄρχων* (dans le dictionnaire de GESENIUS-BUHL, „Oberhaupt”, „Anführer”). En réalité, un tel terme convient parfaitement à Pompée, „chef des rois de la Grèce” (entendons, avec RABINOWITZ lui-même, des rois de la Grèce asiatique, c'est-à-dire des rois de l'Orient hellénisé, y compris le roi de Syrie). Rappelons seulement que la loi Manilia, en 66, attribuait à Pompée, en vue de la guerre contre Mithridate et Tigrane, une autorité souveraine sur tous les pays d'Asie (voir le *De imperio Cn. Pompei* de Cicéron); Plutarque (*Pomp.*, XXX, 2) dénombre ainsi les territoires livrés à son *imperium*: Bithynie, Pont, Asie, Cilicie, Colchide, Phrygie, Lycaonie, Galatie, Cappadoce, Arménie. Un simple regard sur la carte politique de l'Asie mineure et de la Syrie telle qu'elle se dessine en 63 avant J.-C., — après que, grâce à Pompée, le roi du Pont eut été vaincu, que le roi d'Arménie eut fait sa soumission, que la déchéance de la dynastie des rois séleucides eut été prononcée et la Syrie réduite en province romaine —, montre à l'évidence que le chef romain, investi par la loi Manilia de pouvoirs exceptionnels et désormais le maître de toute une pléiade de rois orientaux (cf. J. CARCOPINO, *Histoire romaine*, t. II, p. 585 s.), méritait pleinement le titre que lui donne l'auteur juif de l'*Écrit de Damas*. Rappelons encore, concernant les Romains et l'autorité qu'ils ont sur les rois, ce passage de 1 *Machabées* (viii 12-13): „Ils ont en leur pouvoir les rois voisins et les rois éloignés; tous ceux qui entendent leur nom les redoutent. Tous ceux à qui ils veulent prêter secours et conférer la royauté règnent; ils déposent, par contre, qui leur plaît . . .”. A l'inverse, nous demandons à quel titre un Antiochus Epiphane, ce roi séleucide qui connut de si graves revers, aurait pu être appelé avec quelque vérité „chef des rois de la Grèce”.

Palestine, c'est-à-dire l'année 65, quand le légat M. Aemilius Scaurus vint aussi en Judée pour aplanir le conflit entre Hyrcan II et Aristobule II" (p. 271).

Quant à la date à assigner au *Commentaire d'Habacuc*, c'est très probablement, selon lui, „entre 40 et 36 ou 37 avant J.-C." (p. 273). J'avais proposé moi-même de le dater d'„environ 41 avant J.-C." ¹⁾. L'écart avec la date d'ELLIGER est pratiquement négligeable, et je suis tout prêt, s'il le faut, à descendre d'un ou deux ans.

Sur la question de l'identification du „Prêtre impie", c'est-à-dire du Prêtre persécuteur, ELLIGER se prononce en faveur d'Hyrcan II. Pour ma part, j'avais reconnu et souligné en diverses sections du *Commentaire* des allusions à ce même grand-prêtre; sur ce point encore, ELLIGER réjoint donc l'une de mes conclusions essentielles. Toutefois, l'examen de certains autres passages m'avait amené à situer la mise à mort du Maître de justice un peu avant la prise de Jérusalem par Pompée, en 63 avant J.-C., donc durant le temps du règne d'Aristobule II. J'avais ainsi abouti à une hypothèse complexe qui faisait place à deux grands-prêtres persécuteurs, d'abord Aristobule II, puis son frère Hyrcan II. ELLIGER, au contraire, croit devoir situer l'histoire tout entière du Maître de justice non pas avant, mais après 63; il va même jusqu'à supposer que le Maître de justice, au moment où fut composé le *Commentaire d'Habacuc* (vers 40 avant J.-C., rappelons-le), était encore en vie et, mieux encore, qu'il a peut-être lui-même rédigé cet écrit. En datant de la sorte le ministère du Maître, ELLIGER, c'est évident, ne pouvait être tenté, ainsi que je le fus moi-même, de rapporter à Aristobule II une partie des sections du *Commentaire* concernant le „Prêtre impie", et il a rapporté au seul Hyrcan II la totalité des allusions au personnage maudit.

Je suis le premier à reconnaître qu'une telle simplification de mon hypothèse initiale, si elle est possible, est assurément souhaitable, et aussi que le passage du *Commentaire* concernant la captivité du „Prêtre impie" (ix 9-12), tout à fait essentiel pour l'identification de ce personnage, peut convenir aussi bien à Hyrcan II (qui fut fait prisonnier par les Parthes en 40) qu'à Aristobule II (qui fut fait prisonnier par les Romains en 63). De nouvelles recherches m'ont même amené, sur la base de certains textes historiques auxquels je n'avais pas pensé au début, à considérer qu'on pourrait sans incon-

¹⁾ *Observations sur le Commentaire d'Habacuc* ..., p. 12.

venient laisser de côté le grand-prêtre Aristobule II et considérer Hyrcan II comme le seul prêtre persécuteur, responsable aussi de la mort du Maître de justice; mais à la condition expresse de maintenir — et c'est là un point essentiel, sur lequel je me sépare d'ELLIGER — que le ministère du Maître de justice se situe tout entier non pas après, mais *avant la prise de Jérusalem par Pompée*¹⁾.

Les données archéologiques dont nous disposons maintenant semblent favoriser cette façon de voir, bien plutôt que la date envisagée par ELLIGER pour le ministère du Maître de justice. En effet, les fouilles conduites à Khirbet Qumrân en 1951, 1953 et 1954 ont livré des monnaies nombreuses; beaucoup de celles-ci sont du roi Alexandre Jannée (103-76), ce qui semble bien indiquer que, dès l'époque de ce grand-prêtre, et par conséquent dès le premier tiers du dernier siècle avant J.-C., la communauté de l'Alliance, organisée et dirigée par le Maître de justice, se trouvait installée dans la lauré de Qumrân.

Rappelons, d'autre part, ce texte fort clair de l'*Ecrit de Damas* (i 11-12): „... et Il (Dieu) leur suscita un Maître de justice pour les conduire dans la voie de Son cœur et pour faire connaître aux dernières générations (לדורות אחרונים) ce qu'Il ferait à la dernière génération (כדור אחרון)”²⁾. ELLIGER, à juste titre, insiste sur le fait que, dans l'esprit de l'auteur du *Commentaire*, „la dernière génération” dont il parle (ii 7, vii 2), c'est la génération présente, celle à laquelle lui-même appartient; mais il déclare aussi, comme nous l'avons vu, — et ceci est beaucoup moins sûr, — que le commentateur, écrivant vers 40 avant J.-C., appartient à la même génération que le Maître de justice (p. 268), si même il n'est pas à identifier purement et simplement avec celui-ci. Qu'on y prenne garde: si le Maître, au témoignage de l'*Ecrit de Damas*, a annoncé „aux dernières générations” ce qui arriverait à la „dernière génération”, c'est apparemment qu'il exerça son ministère non pas au temps de „la dernière génération”, c'est-à-dire autour de 40 avant J.-C., mais pour le moins au temps de l'avant-dernière génération, c'est-à-dire, selon la manière hébraïque de compter les générations, environ quarante ans plus tôt. Il est vrai qu'ELLIGER, en étudiant le *Commentaire d'Habacuc*, refuse d'en rapprocher les autres écrits de la secte; mais c'est se priver

¹⁾ Je réserve l'exposé d'ensemble de ces nouvelles recherches pour un autre article, à paraître prochainement.

²⁾ Traduction de Chaïm RABIN, *The Zadokite Documents*, Oxford 1954.

indûment et dangereusement de lumières essentielles pour l'interprétation du *Commentaire d'Habacuc*.

Ainsi, si ELLIGER a raison d'identifier le Prêtre impie avec Hyrcan II, on peut dire, en citant à peu près ses propres paroles (voir p. 249), que, sur ce point même, il mêle le vrai et le faux et que, prise comme un tout, sa théorie est insoutenable. Notre auteur déclare encore que, si le Prêtre impie et le Maître de justice ne sont nulle part nommés de leur propre nom, c'est que l'auteur du *Commentaire*, s'adressant aux contemporains de l'un et de l'autre, n'avait nullement besoin de les désigner autrement: la langue populaire, explique-t-il, dit „le roi, non pas Georges VI; le pape, non pas Pie XII" (p. 268); cet anonymat, selon lui, n'aurait aucune autre raison. Pas de „Decknamen"! Pas une trace de style sibyllin! Cette affirmation est certainement excessive; ELLIGER a justement rapproché le genre de notre *Commentaire* („pesher") et le livre de *Daniel*: or, celui-ci, dans toute sa partie apocalyptique, ne montre-t-il pas un évident et constant souci de taire les noms des personnages historiques dont il parle? Son style est intentionnellement voilé, mystérieux, avec des lumières et des ombres. Et il en va de même d'*Hénoch* et des autres apocalypses dont les adeptes de la secte de l'Alliance étaient si friands. Quoi d'étonnant dès lors que le même trait de style apparaisse dans le *Commentaire d'Habacuc*? La langue populaire, à laquelle se réfère ELLIGER, dit indifféremment „le roi" ou „Georges VI", „le pape" ou „Pie XII". Elle n'exclut pas systématiquement le nom propre. Or, dans le *Commentaire d'Habacuc*, comme dans l'*Ecrit de Damas*, on ne dit jamais Hyrcan II, et l'anonymat du Maître de justice n'est pas une seule fois levé. Ceci n'est pas accidentel; et si le chef de la secte est constamment désigné par un titre si particulier, probablement inspiré de la Bible même ¹⁾, c'est parce que ses fidèles ne le nommaient jamais autrement, par respect pour sa qualité auguste.

II

En ce qui concerne des doctrines contenues dans le *Commentaire d'Habacuc*, la date trop basse adoptée par ELLIGER pour le ministère du Maître de justice l'a entraîné, selon nous, à une grave erreur de perspective, qui fausse entièrement l'exégèse de maints passages. Le *Commentaire*, affirme ELLIGER, „appartient très vraisemblablement à l'époque des fondateurs" de la secte (p. 275): à cette époque, „il ne

¹⁾ Cf. *Osée* x 12, *Joël* ii 23.

peut absolument pas être question d'un système spécial de théologie" (p. 276). Plus tard, admet-il, un tel système a pu se développer dans la secte: le *Manuel de Discipline* et les *Psaumes d'action de grâces* seraient les témoins de cette évolution ultérieure; mais, „dans le *Commentaire d'Habacuc*, tout se trouve encore dans un état embryonnaire" (p. 286).

Cette opinion, croyons-nous, est totalement erronée. Si le *Commentaire*, par sa nature même, ne saurait présenter un exposé systématique des doctrines de la secte, il se montre tout pénétré de celles-ci: elles s'y font jour en toute occasion, et l'on ne peut pénétrer le sens et la portée exacts des allusions doctrinales du *Commentaire* qu'en se référant constamment aux autres écrits de la secte. Le *Commentaire d'Habacuc* n'est pas un écrit isolé; pour le comprendre, il faut de toute nécessité le replonger dans le milieu d'intense spéculation théologique dont il est l'une des manifestations et l'un des produits. ELLIGER, par sa méthode même, a été amené à minimiser le caractère et les traits originaux de la „théologie" qu'atteste le *Commentaire*. Rien, absolument rien n'interdit d'admettre que celle-ci, loin d'être embryonnaire et pour ainsi dire informe, ait déjà derrière elle un certain passé. Et même si le *Commentaire* était l'œuvre du Maître de justice ou de l'un des „fondateurs", pourquoi, en cette génération même, n'aurait-t-on pas déjà élaboré un système de théologie vraiment nouveau et original? Le Maître de justice ne pouvait-il être lui-même l'auteur ou le propagateur d'un système doctrinal déjà évolué, comme le furent tant d'autres „maîtres"? ELLIGER a sans doute voulu réagir contre tel ou tel essai de synthèse qui lui semblait prématuré; mais cette réaction l'a conduit trop loin dans le sens inverse et l'a peut-être éloigné davantage de la juste méthode et des vraies solutions.

Le souci de minimiser me semble particulièrement frappant en ce qui concerne le personnage même du Maître de justice. Pour déterminer aussi objectivement que possible quelle place tenait ce personnage dans la foi de ses disciples, les textes du *Commentaire d'Habacuc* ne se suffisent pas à eux-mêmes; ils doivent être complétés notamment par l'*Ecrit de Damas*, où je persiste à voir des allusions à la qualité messianique du Maître. ELLIGER a trop tendance à ramener le Maître à des proportions communes. Si celui-ci n'avait été à leurs yeux un personnage vraiment hors de pair, les fidèles de la secte de l'Alliance auraient-ils osé interpréter les textes bibliques, et notamment le livre d'*Habacuc*, ainsi qu'ils l'ont fait, c'est-à-dire comme une prédiction constante de l'histoire de ce Maître vénéré, clé de toute

la Révélation ancienne? Cette exégèse biblique entièrement tournée vers le Maître de justice, c'est un fait qui en dit long sur l'exceptionnel prestige dont jouissait le grand Prophète.

Signalons, en particulier, la façon vraiment trop rapide dont ELLIGER examine le passage si important du *Commentaire* où il est dit que „Dieu les sauvera (ceux qui pratiquent la Loi) de la Maison de jugement à cause de leur affliction et de leur foi dans le Maître de justice (בַּעֲמַלָם וְאִמְנַתָם בְּמִוְרָה הַצַּדִּיק) (viii 1-3). ELLIGER traduit: „... um ihrer Plage und ihrer *Treue* willen zu dem Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit" (p. 196). Pourquoi „leur fidélité" (*Treue*), et non pas „leur foi" (*Glaube*)? La plupart des auteurs, tenant justement compte du contexte sotériologique, ont traduit „leur foi"; la foi qui sauve, selon le commentateur, c'est la „foi dans le Maître de justice": expression lourde de sens. ELLIGER ne signale même pas cette traduction, qui mérite du moins d'être discutée, alors que, sur tant de points secondaires et parfois insignifiants, il rappelle et discute minutieusement toutes les opinions divergentes.

III

Nous ne saurions ici examiner en détail toute la traduction d'ELLIGER. Si, venant après plusieurs autres, elle marque sur celles-ci par endroits un certain progrès, elle reste sur plus d'un point, selon nous, tout à fait sujette à caution. Apportons seulement quelques exemples.

Dans v 8-12, où il est question de la mystérieuse „Maison d'Absalom", ELLIGER traduit ainsi les mots בְּתוֹכָהּ מִוְרָה הַצַּדִּיק „bei der *Anklage* gegen den Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit". J'ai traduit, pour ma part: „lors du *châtiment* du Maître de justice", en donnant au mot תּוֹכָהּ un sens bien attesté, le sens même qu'il a un peu plus haut dans le *Commentaire* (v 4). La traduction „Anklage" (accusation), adoptée par ELLIGER, est forcée et incertaine; le mot signifie „preuve", ou „réprimande", ou „châtiment", mais non pas proprement et précisément „accusation (en justice)". Dans notre passage, le sens de „châtiment" est suggéré par le passage biblique ici commenté: „quand l'impie engloutit un plus juste que lui"; „engloutir" (בִּלַּע), cela signifie couramment en hébreu, au sens métaphorique, „ruiner", „anéantir", „faire périr". La traduction d'ELLIGER fait violence au texte et au contexte: il y a plus ici qu'une simple „accusation", c'est du „châtiment" même infligé au Maître de justice qu'il s'agit.

Autre exemple. Dans viii 3-13, où le commentateur stigmatise la cupidité et tous les vices du Prêtre impie, on lit que celui-ci „fut appelé du Nom de vérité au début de son avènement; mais, quand il exerça le commandement sur Israël, son coeur s'éleva, etc.” Ainsi du moins ai-je traduit moi-même, en considérant que l'expression „le Nom de vérité” (שם האמת) désignait ici le Nom de Yahvé lui-même, ce Nom qui était alors imprononçable; le grand-prêtre ici visé, dans le premier temps de son pontificat, aurait été „appelé du nom de Yahvé”, c'est-à-dire aurait mérité, par sa conduite pieuse et sans doute aussi par ses bonnes dispositions à l'égard de la secte de l'Alliance, le titre de saint prêtre, de prêtre de Yahvé. ELLIGER traduit autrement: „er wurde berufen unter dem rechten Namen”; „le vrai nom”, selon lui, serait simplement celui de „grand-prêtre” (הכהן הראש), que plus tard les fidèles déçus auraient transformé en celui de „prêtre impie” (הכהן הרשע): jeu de mots, explique ELLIGER. Mais je doute fort que notre commentateur ait eu autant d'esprit qu'ELLIGER. S'il avait vraiment voulu faire ici un calembour sur les mots הראש et הרשע, il se serait sans doute exprimé en termes plus clairs.

Quant aux mots qui suivent: „et quand il exerça le commandement sur Israël” (וכאשר משל בישראל), ELLIGER explique qu'on a là „vraisemblablement un terme technique pour désigner l'exercice de la fonction de grand-prêtre à l'époque postexilique”; mais un tel sens „technique” est conjectural. En réalité, il faut ici, selon nous, laisser au mot משל son sens habituel, celui de „dominer, commander”: ce mot désigne donc non pas de façon générale l'exercice de la fonction de grand-prêtre, mais précisément et proprement celui de la souveraineté temporelle. Ainsi, dans la carrière du grand-prêtre visé, le commentateur se trouve distinguer deux phases successives: celle du „début de son avènement” (בתחלה עומדו), puis celle où il en vint à exercer la souveraineté temporelle (וכאשר משל בישראל); dans la première phase, par conséquent, le grand-prêtre auquel il est fait allusion n'exerça qu'une fonction religieuse, sans souveraineté temporelle, et c'est seulement dans la seconde phase, à partir du moment où il „commanda”, qu'il changea de conduite et se comporta en „prêtre impie”.

Cette carrière en deux temps, croyons-nous, constitue un trait précis, d'un intérêt essentiel pour le problème de l'identification du „Prêtre impie”. Seul, en effet, parmi les dynastes asmonéens, Hyrcan II eut une carrière qui réponde exactement à cette allusion du

Commentaire. Rappelons brièvement que, nommé grand-prêtre en 76, à la mort de son père Alexandre Jannée, il n'eut d'abord à exercer que des fonctions purement religieuses, jusqu'à la mort de sa mère Alexandra, laquelle, en tant que reine, assumait elle-même le gouvernement temporel. C'est seulement à la mort de celle-ci, en 67, qu'Hyrkan II fut proclamé roi, inaugurant ainsi la seconde phase de sa carrière, celle où „il exerça le commandement en Israël"; et cette phase se prolongea, après une brève interruption due à l'usurpation de son frère cadet Aristobule II, jusqu'en 40, date où il devint prisonnier des Parthes. Ce long pontificat comprend donc effectivement deux périodes: la première, de 9 ans, sans autorité temporelle; la seconde, de 27 ans (y compris le temps de l'usurpation d'Aristobule II), où Hyrcan fut aussi le chef politique d'Israël, d'abord comme roi, puis comme ethnarque. L'allusion du *Commentaire*, bien comprise, me semble donc en parfaite concordance avec l'histoire même d'Hyrkan II¹); l'interprétation d'ELLIGER élimine indûment de cette allusion un trait précis de grande importance.

IV

Passons à la péricope suivante (viii 13-ix 7), d'une interprétation délicate et particulièrement discutée; cette péricope comporte, en effet, au bas de la colonne viii, une assez longue lacune, qui laisse planer une certaine obscurité sur le début de la colonne ix. J'ai traduit ainsi ce début (ix 1-2): „[. . .] le frapper en vertu de jugements iniques; et d'odieux profanateurs ont commis des horreurs sur lui et des vengeances sur son corps de chair"; et j'ai cherché à montrer que ce passage ne pouvait pas s'appliquer au Prêtre impie, mais seulement au Maître de justice, dont il évoque l'injuste condamnation et le douloureux martyre²). BROWNLEE et d'autres auteurs, au contraire, ont rapporté ce passage au Prêtre impie et au châtiment divin infligé à celui-ci. Pour sa part, ELLIGER prend nettement parti pour l'application du passage au Maître de justice (p. 202 et n. 2): si l'on parle de „jugements iniques", n'est-il pas clair que ces mots, sous la plume du commentateur, ne peuvent désigner qu'une innocente victime, le Maître de justice, et non pas le Prêtre impie?

¹ Ainsi que nous l'avons noté dès 1950: cf. *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, t. CXXXVII, pp. 162-163.

² *V. T.* I, 1951, pp. 202-207; cf. *RHR*, t. CXXXVII, 1950, pp. 145-147, 164.

Mais ELLIGER, tout en se ralliant sur ce point important à ma façon de voir, ne suit pas ma traduction jusqu'au bout. Les mots **וּשְׁעֲרֵי מַחֲלִים רָעִים עָשָׂה בּוֹ** avaient été ainsi traduit par BROWNLEE: "while the horrors of evil diseases they execute upon him"; ELLIGER, à son tour, traduit: „Und Abscheulichkeiten durch schlimme Krankheiten verübten sie an ihm". Le débat porte essentiellement sur le sens du mot **מַחֲלִים**. Est-ce, comme l'entendent BROWNLEE et ELLIGER, le pluriel du mot **מַחֲלָה** „maladie" (racine **חלה**)? Mais ce pluriel **מַחֲלִים** n'est pas attesté en hébreu biblique (où l'on trouve seulement **מַחֲלָיִים**); et surtout il faut observer que les bourreaux infligent à leurs victimes des coups, des supplices, mais non pas, à proprement parler, des „maladies". ELLIGER explique qu'il s'agirait d'une maladie grave („eine schlimme Krankheit") que le Maître de justice aurait contractée durant son incarcération, sans doute à la suite des mauvais traitements dont il aurait été l'objet (p. 267). Mais cette interprétation fait violence au texte; celui-ci, si l'on donne à **מַחֲלִים** le sens de „maladies", ne peut se traduire que comme suit: les ennemis du Maître „ont commis (**עָשָׂה**) sur lui des horreurs de maladies graves". Il s'agit ici d'„horreurs" commises *directement* contre la personne du Maître: si l'auteur du *Commentaire* avait voulu dire que „des maladies graves" furent la conséquence de ces „horreurs", l'expression employée: „des horreurs de maladies graves", serait extraordinairement étrange et excessivement maladroite.

La difficulté disparaît si l'on fait de **מַחֲלִים רָעִים** non pas le complément de **שְׁעֲרֵי**, mais le sujet du verbe **עָשָׂה**. C'est pourquoi, rattachant le mot difficile **מַחֲלִים** à la racine **חלל**, j'ai traduit „profanateurs" (participle *hifil*): „et des profanateurs odieux (littéralement: méchants) ont commis des horreurs sur lui et des vengeances sur son corps de chair". Au lieu d'une expression lourde et surchargée, on obtient ainsi une phrase coulante et parfaitement équilibrée. Le mot „profanateurs" est ici pleinement justifié, puisque le Maître de justice, victime de ces horreurs et de ces vengeances, est une personne sainte entre toutes. ELLIGER écarte cette traduction pour la seule raison qu'„elle contredirait dans la construction de la phrase le style du commentateur" (p. 202). Mais je ne crois pas que le style du commentateur soit à considérer comme un pur galimatias. S'il affectionne les redondances, des exemples comme **עַן אֲשָׁמָה** (viii 12), **נָתַתְּ טָמְאָה** (viii 13), **גִּיַת בִּשְׂרוֹ** (ix 2), **כַּעַס חֲמָתוֹ** (xi 5), n'ont absolument rien à voir avec cette bizarre locution: **שְׁעֲרֵי מַחֲלִים רָעִים**, dont ELLIGER les rapproche indûment (p. 109 s).

ELLIGER ne refuse pas au Maître de justice „l'auréole du martyr", pour employer sa propre expression (p. 267); il admet que celui-ci fut traduit en justice, qu'il subit de mauvais traitements et qu'il souffrit en son corps. Mais Hyrcan II, précise-t-il, se serait contenté, à l'égard de ce „rêveur" (p. 250), en réalité peu dangereux, d'employer simplement des „demi-mesures" (p. 274): le Maître de justice, du fait de la persécution, aurait contracté „des maladies graves", mais il n'aurait point été mis à mort. Je pense, au contraire, que le mouvement d'opposition fanatique dirigé par le chef de la secte de l'Alliance pouvait représenter du point de vue politique un très grave danger et qu'Hyrcan II prit contre ce mouvement des mesures de répression extrêmement énergiques, allant jusqu'à l'exécution du Maître de justice. C'est ce que me semble indiquer un autre passage du *Commentaire* (xi 2-8), dont nous parlerons en terminant.

V

Ce passage est de tous le plus controversé. Les deux mots אֲבִית גִּלוּתוֹ (ligne 6), notamment, ont mis les traducteurs dans un grand embarras. La plupart d'entre eux ont rattaché le mot אֲבִית (qu'on peut lire aussi אֲבוֹת) à la racine אָבָה „vouloir". C'est ainsi qu'ELLIGER a traduit „in der Absicht", en considérant le mot אֲבוֹת comme „l'accusatif adverbial d'un substantif"; mais il met lui-même un point d'interrogation près de cette explication grammaticale, dont il faut bien dire qu'elle est singulièrement imprécise (de quel substantif s'agit-il?) et proprement désespérée. J'ai proposé moi-même, d'après la même racine, „on a voulu, on a osé", en faisant de אֲבוֹת un infinitif absolu, ce qui me semblait grammaticalement plus acceptable. Seuls, H. YALON et A. M. HABERMANN¹⁾ avaient suggéré de reconnaître dans אֲבִית l'équivalent de בֵּית „dans la maison", équivalence attestée dans la Tosefta et les Baraïtas; mais l'on pouvait hésiter à admettre dans le *Commentaire d'Habacuc*, si on le date du Ier siècle avant notre ère, une forme qui ne se rencontrait ailleurs qu'assez tardivement. Or, dans une lettre trouvée en 1952 dans l'une des grottes de Murabba'at²⁾, on lit ceci, à la ligne 4: שִׁיּוֹשֵׁב אֲבִית מִשְׁכּוֹ „qui habite à Bêt-Masko"; le mot אֲבִית est ici clairement l'équivalent de בֵּית. La

¹⁾ Voir 'Edah we-Eduth (Jérusalem 1952), p. 54. M. H. SEGAL, de son côté, a proposé de voir dans אֲבִית une contraction de אֵל בֵּית. En réalité, dans אֲבִית, la préposition se trouve précédée d'un א prosthétique: אֲבִית > אֲבִית > אֲבִית.

²⁾ Publiée par R. DE VAUX dans RB, 1953, p. 270-275, planche XIII.

présence de la forme אבית pour בבית dans un document hébreu de 132/135 de notre ère permet sans doute de lever les hésitations qu'on pouvait avoir sur le sens de אבית dans le *Commentaire d'Habacuc*. Pour ma part, je traduirai donc désormais les deux mots: אבית גלותו „en sa maison d'exil”, „en sa résidence d'exil”.

Par suite, la phrase des lignes 4-6 est, selon nous, à traduire tout entière comme suit: „L'explication de ceci concerne le Prêtre impie qui a persécuté le Maître de justice au point de l'engloutir¹⁾ dans l'emportement de sa fureur en sa résidence d'exil”. La correction partielle portant sur l'interprétation des deux mots אבית גלותו ne change rien d'essentiel à notre exégèse antérieure de l'ensemble de la phrase. Elle vient même confirmer, croyons-nous, la thèse que nous avons toujours soutenue, à savoir que le Maître de justice fut réellement mis à mort²⁾. En effet, suivant la traduction nouvelle, il est clair que le Maître avait été d'abord contraint de s'exiler; mais la „fureur” du prêtre impie ne s'en tint pas là: le persécuteur, lisons-nous, „engloutit le Maître . . . en sa résidence d'exil”. Le mot hébreu בלע „engloutir” peut-il vraiment avoir ici, étant donné le contexte, un autre sens que celui, tout à fait courant, de „faire périr”? Le châtiment ne fut pas seulement l'exil, mais la mise à mort dans le lieu d'exil. Quel fut ce lieu d'exil? On penserait volontiers à la région de Damas, où nous savons précisément par l'*Ecrit de Damas* que la secte de l'Alliance dut s'exiler, en même temps que „l'Etoile”, c'est-à-dire le Maître lui-même³⁾. Rien n'empêche d'admettre

¹⁾ Le texte porte לבלעו. L'infinitif avec ל est ici employé non pas au sens final ou consécutif, mais, comme il est fréquent, „pour exprimer une action qui précise ou explique la précédente” (Joüon, *Grammaire de l'Hébreu biblique*, p. 363, § 124 o); il équivaut à un gérondif latin en *-do*. On pourrait traduire en français: „en l'engloutissant”.

²⁾ Cf. V.T. I, 1951, pp. 200-215.

³⁾ Récemment, I. RABINOWITZ, dans un article intitulé: „A Reconsideration of „Damascus” and „390 years” in the „Damascus” („Zadokite”) Fragments” (*JBL* LXXIII, 1954, pp. 11-35), a cherché à montrer que cet exil de la secte de l'Alliance à Damas, en dépit des assertions apparemment fort claires de l'*Ecrit de Damas*, n'était qu'une pure illusion, résultat d'une grave méprise sur le sens du mot „Damas”; ce mot inspiré d'*Amos* v 27, désignerait, en fait, de façon en quelque sorte allégorique, le lieu où les Juifs furent déportés en 586, c'est-à-dire la Babylonie, — et non pas, comme on l'a pensé jusqu'à présent, la capitale syrienne. D'autre part, l'expression שבי ישראל, qu'on lit plusieurs fois dans l'*Ecrit de Damas* (iv 2, vi 5, viii 16, xix 29), serait à traduire non pas „les convertis (שבִּי) d'Israël”, ainsi qu'on l'a fait généralement, mais „la captivité (שבִּי) d'Israël”; et, par conséquent, les passages où l'on a cru voir la mention d'un exil des membres de la secte au pays de Damas viseraient en réalité la grande

qu'Hyrscan II ait pu, légalement ou non, poursuivre son ennemi jusqu'à Damas; qu'on se rappelle, simplement à titre de comparaison, comment le grand-prêtre Ménélas, en 170, fit exécuter Onias, exilé à Antioche (2 *Machabées* iv 31-35).

Quoi qu'il en soit, le document de Murabba'at me semble venir opportunément résoudre l'énigme que constituaient dans le *Commentaire d'Habacuc* les deux mots אבית גלותו. ELLIGER a traduit comme suit la phrase entière: „Seine Meinung geht auf den gottlosen Priester, insofern er den Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit verfolgte, ihn zu verschlingen in der Wut seines Grimms, in der Absicht, ihn blosszustellen (oder: abzusetzen)”. Le mot גלותו, selon lui, n'aurait pas ici le sens d'„exiler” ni proprement celui de „dévêtir”, mais ou bien un sens métaphorique: „découvrir, démasquer (blossstellen)”, ou bien un sens technique: „dépouiller (de la dignité sacerdotale)”, c'est-à-dire „déposer (absetzen)”. Explications bien recherchées et bien incertaines. Quant au verbe בלע, si ELLIGER le traduit correctement „engloutir (verschlingen)”, il refuse absolument de comprendre que ce verbe ait ici, comme très généralement en hébreu, le sens de „perdre, faire périr”. Hyrcan II, explique-t-il, ennemi des mesures extrêmes, ne pouvait considérer que les rêveries mystiques du Maître de justice méritassent la peine de mort (p. 215): en s'attaquant à lui, il voulut seulement „le faire taire, non le faire mourir (mundtot machen, aber nicht töten)” (p. 217). C'est méconnaître, croyons-nous, la puissance redoutable, sur le plan politique même, de certaines

déportation de 586. Mais l'expression שבי ישראל doit évidemment être rapprochée de celle-ci: שבי פשע „les convertis du péché”, qu'on lit dans l'*Ecrit de Damas* (ii 5, xx 17) et dans le *Manuel de Discipline* (x 20), et qui est empruntée directement à *Isaïe* lix 20 שְׁבִי פֶשַׁע בִּיעֶקֶב. En outre, pourquoi l'auteur, s'il avait

voulu désigner, à l'aide de quelque référence biblique, la Captivité de Babylone, aurait-il choisi le nom de Damas, alors qu'il est expressément question de la Captivité de Babylone en d'innombrables textes bibliques? S'il s'est attaché au texte d'*Amos* v 27, c'est que ce texte — à condition de lire non pas מהלאה לדמשק „au-delà de Damas”, avec le texte massorétique, mais, comme fait l'*Ecrit de Damas* lui-même, מאהלי דמשק „from My tent to Damascus” (traduction RABIN) — lui semblait prophétiser proprement la situation des membres de la secte qui, pour échapper à la persécution, avaient dû effectivement quitter le pays de Juda et s'exiler au pays de Damas. Si la réalité de cet exil de Damas gêne le système de datation adopté par RABINOWITZ pour les divers manuscrits trouvés à Qumrân (voir *V.T.* III, 1953, p. 185), c'est peut-être plutôt ce système de datation (second quart du second siècle avant J.-C.) qu'il faut considérer comme incertain et illusoire. L'exil de Damas est un fait qu'on ne peut éliminer sans faire violence aux textes; je le situe, pour ma part, d'environ 65/63 à 40/37 avant J.-C. (voir mes *Aperçus préliminaires* ..., p. 65, 114).

confréries mystiques, tant dans l'antiquité qu'aujourd'hui, particulièrement en Orient. Mais surtout on s'étonne, si le Prêtre persécuteur s'était vraiment montré à l'égard du Maître de justice aussi pondéré que le suppose ELLIGER, que l'auteur du *Commentaire* ait souligné dans notre passage même que le Prêtre avait agi „dans l'emportement de sa fureur”. En réalité, la persécution que subirent le Maître de justice et sa secte fut sanglante et tragique; c'est ce que montre clairement l'*Ecrit de Damas* (i 20-21): „... et ils attentèrent à la vie du juste, et leur âme avait pris en horreur tous ceux qui marchent dans la perfection (entendons: les adeptes de la secte de l'Alliance), et ils les persécutèrent *par la glaive* (וִירְדָּפּוֹם כֶּחֶרֶב) ...” Conformément à sa méthode, ELLIGER ne tient aucun compte d'un tel texte; il résulte nettement de ce texte, cependant, qu'on aurait tort de minimiser l'importance et la gravité des mesures qui furent prises contre la secte mystique et son chef.

Ajoutons qu'un précieux passage de Diodore de Sicile (xl, fragment 2) nous représente Hyrcan II tout autrement que se figure ELLIGER: c'est au printemps de 63, quand Pompée se trouve à Damas et, préoccupé des affaires de Judée, convoque les deux rivaux, Aristobule II et Hyrcan II ¹⁾. Une délégation comprenant „les plus distingués d'entre les Juifs, au nombre de plus de deux cents”, se présente alors également devant le général romain. Ces Juifs ne veulent ni d'Aristobule ni d'Hyrcan, qui, déclarent-ils, „gouvernent au mépris des lois nationales et ont injustement asservi les citoyens”, et qui „se sont emparés de la royauté par la multitude des mercenaires et *par des violences et par des meurtres nombreux et impies*”; Pompée, lisons-nous encore, „blâma sévèrement Hyrcan de sa conduite illégale envers les Juifs ...”. Ainsi, en ce temps-là, il existait contre les deux frères une opposition puissante, celle des Juifs qui, par respect pour „les lois nationales”, ne voulaient pas être commandés par un roi; leur acharnement alla même jusqu'à faire appel à l'arbitrage de l'étranger et à demander au Romain de condamner les deux rivaux. A cette opposition, nullement anodine, Aristobule et Hyrcan répondirent, chacun de leur côté, „par des violences et par des meurtres nombreux et impies”. C'est précisément en cette période critique, où les passions politiques, chez les Juifs, étaient déchaînées, que doit se situer, selon nous, l'exécution du Maître de justice; que l'auteur en ait été Hyrcan II ou bien Aristobule II, le récit de Diodore nous montre que l'un et l'autre savaient sévir avec la plus extrême rigueur.

¹⁾ Voir aussi Josèphe, *A.J.*, XIV, 3, 2.

Nous ne pouvons nous étendre ici sur la phrase suivante du *Commentaire* (xi 6-8). Nous l'avons ainsi traduite: „Mais, au moment de la fête chômée du Jour des Expiations, il leur ait apparu pour les engloutir et pour les faire trébucher au Jour de Jeûne, leur sabbat chômé". Selon nous, le sujet de הופיע „il est apparu" ne peut être que le Maître de justice, car le verbe הופיע, si on lui donne comme sujet le Prêtre impie, ainsi que le font plusieurs auteurs, ne nous semble présenter aucun sens vraiment acceptable. ELLIGER, cependant, tente un nouvel effort dans cette voie; mais il ne réussit qu'à rendre plus manifeste l'impossibilité d'une telle exégèse. Récemment, BONSIIVEN a ainsi traduit le passage: „... il (Dieu) leur est apparu"¹⁾; je ne crois pas que le sujet du verbe soit ici „Dieu", comme il le suppose, car le mot Dieu eût sans doute été exprimé; mais cette interprétation, qui ne torture pas le sens du mot הופיע, me semble bien préférable à celle d'ELLIGER. Pourquoi ne pas admettre que le sujet est le Maître de justice? Il y aurait, objecte-t-on, un changement de sujet de la première à la seconde phrase; mais un tel changement de sujet est un fait tout à fait courant dans le style hébreu, ainsi que chacun le sait. Si le sujet de הופיע, comme me semble l'exiger le sens, est bien le Maître de justice, il serait même plutôt anormal, en hébreu, de répéter ici les mots מורה הצדק, qui sont le complément du verbe précédent. L'allusion à la prise de Jérusalem par Pompée, — cet événement considérable dont les *Psaumes de Salomon* nous ont si heureusement conservé l'écho —, me paraît toujours, en dépit des objections d'ELLIGER, l'explication la plus plausible de cette phrase énigmatique²⁾.

¹⁾ *La Bible apocryphe*, Paris 1953, p. 179.

²⁾ J'ai repris ce sujet en dernier lieu dans mes *Nouveaux aperçus* ..., 1953, pp. 54-61. (= *The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes*, Londres, 1954, pp. 32-37).

YAHWEH AS "THE GOD OF MY FATHER"

BY

J. PHILIP HYATT

Nashville

Many theories have been proposed to explain the origin of Mosaic Yahwism. The theory which appears to be most widely held by critical scholars is that Moses learned the worship of Yahweh from the Midianites (or Kenites) through his father-in-law, who was a priest¹). This theory can find some support in Biblical passages, but involves a large amount of speculation regarding matters on which we are not informed in the Old Testament. We shall doubtless never reach unanimity of opinion on this problem, but I wish to propose a theory which I believe to be new. It has the merit of being based directly on Biblical evidence, and it makes use of recent studies of the religion of the period immediately preceding Moses.

I

In his monograph *Der Gott der Väter*²), Albrecht ALT studied the Genesis narratives dealing with patriarchal religion and advanced the hypothesis that each of the great patriarchs worshipped a special patron deity, in addition to whatever other deities he may have feared. This deity, or numen, appeared to the patriarch in a special revelation; the patriarch then worshipped him as his patron and passed on his cult to his descendants. Thus, the special deity of Abraham was called אלהי אברהם; Isaac's deity was פחד יצחק, translated by ALT as *der Schreck Isaaks*; and Jacob's special deity was אביר יעקב, "the Mighty One of Jacob". On the basis of Gen. xv 1, LESLIE has suggested that the name of Abraham's god was "the Shield of Abraham"³); and ALBRIGHT thinks that the name of

¹) For a recent statement of the theory see H. H. ROWLEY, *From Joseph to Joshua* (Schweich Lectures 1948), London 1950, pp. 149-61.

²) Originally published in *Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament*, ed. by R. KITTEL, III/12, Stuttgart 1929; reprinted in ALT, *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, I, München 1953, pp. 1-78.

³) *Old Testament Religion in the Light of its Canaanite Background*, New York and Nashville 1936, p. 67.

Isaac's god should be rendered "the Kinsman of Isaac" ¹⁾. ALT was able to point to parallels in the religion of the Palmyrenians and Nabateans, who lived about a thousand years later than the Hebrew patriarchs, but in a culture which was similar to patriarchal culture.

Julius LEWY, in an article dealing with the contribution of Old Assyrian cuneiform texts to Biblical interpretation ²⁾, pointed out that the phrase "god of thy father" occurs in those texts, particularly in the formula *Aššur u il abika liṭṭulā*, "Asshur and the god of thy father be witness". LEWY thought that this "god of thy father" was identical with Ilabrat (whose name occurs in the second position in some forms of the formula); he was critical of ALT's theory regarding patriarchal religion, believing that the father's god was not a separate deity, but identical with *El Shaddai*. For our purpose, the significant feature about LEWY's study is that it points to a parallel to the patriarchal patron deity in a period not far removed from the time when the patriarchs presumably lived.

This type of deity occurs in other Near Eastern texts that have been recently discovered and published.

In a letter found at Mari (eighteenth century B.C.), written from Išhi-Addu, king of Qatna, to Išme-Dagan, king of Ekallatim, the following phrase occurs: *aš-šum ilim ša a-bi-ia* ³⁾, which is to be translated "by the god of my father". ⁴⁾ This witness is significant because of the date and provenience of the letter; other important parallels to early Biblical narratives have come from Mari.

The same type of deity may occur also on the hieroglyphic Hittite inscription found at Topada, which H. E. DEL MEDICO has recently attempted to decipher and translate ⁵⁾. He finds on the lines numbered 411, 701, 707, 716, and 818 a phrase which he reads DINGIR *dada* (*me*)

¹⁾ *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, Baltimore 1940, pp. 188-89, 327. Cf. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LIV, 1935, pp. 188-91.

²⁾ "Les textes paléo-assyriens et l'Ancien Testament", *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, CX, 1934, 29-65; see pp. 50-64.

³⁾ G. DOSSIN, *Archives Royales de Mari*, V, *TCL* XXVI; Paris 1951, text 20, line 16.

⁴⁾ G. DOSSIN, *Archives Royales de Mari*, V: *Correspondance de Iasmah-Addu*, Paris, 1952, p. 37, translates the phrase "à cause du dieu de mon père", but he notes (p. 129) that C. J. GADD prefers to render it "par le nom du dieu de mon père". In the latter case, he says, *aššum* has its original meaning as derived from *ana šum*. This seems to be correct.

⁵⁾ "L'inscription hiéroglyphique de Top-ada", *Archiv Orientalní*, XVII, 1949, 117-152 (= *Symbolae ad Studia Orientalis Pertinentes Frederico Hrozný Dedicatae*, Pars Prima). I am greatly indebted to my friend, Prof. G. E. MENDENHALL, University of Michigan, for calling my attention to this text and the Mari letter.

(r) and translates "le dieu des ancêtres." In all except the first occurrence the phrase is followed by *ma-aš* or *ma-an*, translated "vigoureux", as modifying the deity. DEL MEDICO, in commenting on this inscription, expresses the belief that for Parminah, the place where the inscription was written, the "god of the ancestors" was Salamulu the king himself, because the same adjective (*ma-aš*) is applied to him in the first line. This is possible, especially in view of the Hittite practise of deifying deceased kings, but the interpretation is not wholly necessary. It should be observed that nothing in the sign group compels us to take as plural the word which is translated "ancestors". In the first line the very same sign appears, where it must be singular, since it describes the king. We may have to do, therefore, with a "father's god", that is, the patron deity of an ancestor ¹). DEL MEDICO dates this inscription in the eighth century B.C. It belongs in any event to the neo-Hittite period which followed the fall of the Hittite Empire. In the present state of our knowledge (or ignorance!) of hieroglyphic Hittite, we should draw no far-reaching conclusions from this inscription, but only note that it may indicate the worship of a father's god.

C. H. GORDON has suggested that a cult similar to that of the patriarchs existed at Ugarit ²). He refers to a phrase in the Keret text (line 41), *tr.abh*, which he says describes El as the "Bull of his [Keret's] father". It seems probable that we should rather translate the phrase "Bull, his father", El being referred to as the father of Keret. While we do sometimes find the phrase *tr.abh.il* or the like (for example, Keret 59, 76-7, 169), we also find the phrase *tr.il.abk* (GORDON 129, lines 16, 17), which should be rendered "Bull El, thy father" ³). In any event the evidence here does not indicate that the cult, if indeed it was of a "father's god" type, was a separate cult. Even if GORDON is correct, the "Bull of thy/his father" is El.

In discussing the Biblical evidence for a deity of this type, Herbert G. MAY has pointed out that the Biblical passages should be sifted more carefully than was done by ALT ⁴). He maintained that we are

¹) There is no reference to this type of deity in E. LAROCHE, *Recherches sur les Noms des Dieux Hittites*, Paris 1947.

²) "The Patriarchal Age", *Journal of Bible and Religion* XXI, 1953, 238-43; see p. 239.

³) See the translations of Ugaritic texts by H. L. GINSBERG in James B. PRITCHARD, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, Princeton 1950, pp. 129 ff.

⁴) "The God of My Father—a Study of Patriarchal Religion", *Journal of Bible and Religion*, IX, 1941, 155-58, 200.

dealing in the Old Testament with two different titles: "the god of my (thy, etc.) father" and "the god of my (thy, etc.) fathers". The former is a genuine title in patriarchal religion, but the latter title is late, occurring almost exclusively in passages that are quite late.

2

If we accept ALT's theory regarding patriarchal religion as basically correct, with refinements and revisions as made by others, and then note that the phrase "the god of my (thy) father" occurs three times in narratives concerning Moses, we may find a clue to the origin of Moses' worship of Yahweh. The three passages are Exodus iii 6, xv 2, and xviii 4. MAY recognized these passages as important, but declared that the title was in these instances archaistic, and not a part of the living vocabulary of Moses' time. It seems very arbitrary to say that the title is archaistic here in Exodus and not in the patriarchal narratives, since the documents in which it occurs all come from a time later than both the patriarchs and Moses. The title ought to be taken seriously as part of the living vocabulary of Moses' religion as well as of patriarchal religion.

The first of the three passages is Exodus iii 6. This is in the account of Moses' experience at the burning bush. He hears Yahweh (or the angel of Yahweh) say to him: "I am the god of thy father, the god of Abraham, the god of Isaac, and the god of Jacob". MT has **אנכי אלהי אבתיך**. The Samaritan text has as the last word **אבותיך** and thus reads "god of thy fathers". It seems probable, however, that MT is correct, the Samaritan being influenced by the plural formula, which occurs later in the same chapter, vss. 15-16. Inasmuch as the plural formula is far more frequent in occurrence, it is very significant that when Moses is reported to have first heard the title it is in the form, "the god of thy father". This may well be an accurate record of Moses' experience. The latter part of the verse which contains the formula, "the god of Abraham, the god of Isaac, and the god of Jacob", is the result of later theological reflection, when Yahweh became amalgamated with the patriarchal patron deities after the Hebrews entered Canaan.

The second passage is Exodus xv 2. This is in the song which Moses and the people of Israel sang after the crossing of the Red Sea. Vs. 2 may be translated as follows:

Yah is my strength and my song,
 and has become my salvation;
 this is my God, and I will praise him,
 the god of my father (אלהי אבי), and I
 will exalt him.

The poem now preserved in Exodus xv 1-18 is undoubtedly late in its present full form; it can hardly be earlier than the settlement in Palestine, for vss. 13-18 speak of events involved in that settlement. Some scholars date it very late; PFEIFFER, for example, puts it in the second half of the fifth century ¹). However, the first twelve verses of the poem contain no ideas and refer to no events which make it necessary to date them late. They may well have been composed not long after the crossing of the Red Sea, and handed down orally for a period of time before being written down. The representation of Yahweh as "a man of war" (vs. 3), who fights against the Egyptians by the use of his "wind" (vs. 10) or "the blast of thy nostrils" (vs. 8), and who is a god among other gods (vs. 11)—all of this is entirely appropriate to the time of Moses. In vs. 2 we probably have a genuine reminiscence of the formula "the god of my father", which goes back to the Mosaic age.

The third occurrence is Exodus xviii 4. This is in the E account of the visit of Jethro with Moses, an account which is one of the cornerstones of the Midianite (Kenite) theory of the origin of Yahwism ²). Vss. 2-4 relate that Jethro had taken Zipporah and her two sons after Moses had sent them back to Midian, and explain the names of the two children. The second child has the name Eliezer, and the explanation of it is: "For the god of my father was my help (כי-אלהי אבי בעזרי) and delivered me from the sword of Pharaoh." The reference to the returning of Moses' wife and children from Midian is quite obscure, for we are never told that Moses had sent them back to Midian. Also, the place of Jethro's visit with Moses is uncertain. Vs. 5 seems to indicate that it took place at Sinai ("the mountain of God"), but the narrative does not actually bring the Hebrews to Sinai until ch. xix. Regardless of these difficulties, the explanation of

¹) *Introduction to the Old Testament*, New York and London 1941, p. 281.

²) See the recent article by Chr. H. W. BREKELMANS, "Exodus XVIII and the Origins of Yahwism in Israel", *Oudtestamentische Studiën*, X, 1954, 215-24. He maintains that Jethro came to Israel in order to make an alliance with it, and that this chapter is a record of the covenant ceremony between Midian and Israel, and has nothing to do with the introduction of Yahwism among the Israelites by Jethro.

the name of the second child seems very likely to be an ancient one, particularly in view of the fact that it is not the explanation we expect from the name itself. The child's name may originally have been "El-abi-ezer" or the like, and subsequently it became shortened to the more common form "Eli-ezer". Thus the name probably contained the formula, "god of my father", as a genuine recollection of Moses' experience at the burning bush. We cannot now determine whether the child was born while Moses was still in Midian, perhaps soon after the experience at the burning bush, or later. If the latter part of the explanation of the name is genuine, "and delivered me from the sword of Pharaoh", the child was born after the Hebrews crossed the Red Sea. It is far easier to suppose that the name was shortened from the form suggested to Eliezer, than to suppose that an original "Eliezer" was expanded, or was explained by the use of the longer formula, especially since the usual form of the later period was "the god of my fathers".

3

On the basis of these references in Exodus to the god of Moses' father, and ALT's theory regarding patriarchal religion, we may construct a theory to explain the origin of Moses' knowledge of Yahwism. There must be a considerable amount of speculation in our theory, but that is inevitable in dealing with an age for which we have such a small amount of authentic material.

We may conjecture that Yahweh was in the first instance the patron deity of one of Moses' ancestors. He was not necessarily the deity of Moses' own father. The ancestor in question is more likely to have been his grandfather or a more remote ancestor. It is not necessary to suppose that the ancestor was in the line of Moses' father, Amram, for it may as well have been through his mother. She is reported to have borne the name Jochebed (Exodus vi 20, Numbers xxvi 59), apparently a theophoric name with the divine element "Yahweh" in shortened form¹). Since she is described as the aunt (father's sister) of Amram, the patron deity Yahweh may have been handed down through either line.

It is possible that the family of Moses had been in Egypt only a short time before Moses' birth. The borders of Egypt were crossed

¹) See T. J. MEEK, *Hebrew Origins*, Revised Edition, New York 1950, p. 97. Since the name is preserved only in P we can, in my opinion, have little confidence in its authenticity.

frequently by nomads and travelers, and the people later known as Israelites was composed of several disparate elements. If Moses' family had only recently come into Egypt, that would help explain his reaction to the brutal treatment accorded one of his fellow-tribesmen, which led to the murder of an Egyptian and Moses' subsequent flight to Midian. His reaction was not that of one whose family had been in Egypt for a long time and had become accustomed to injustice, but of a newcomer from the desert, with ideas of freedom and justice known in the desert.

We may go on to conjecture that Moses' family came into Egypt from Midianite territory. That would readily account for his flight to Midian, his experience with Yahweh at the burning bush, and the close associations between Midianites (or Kenites) and Hebrews. Our theory can do justice to the valid elements in the hypothesis that Moses' knowledge of Yahwism was derived from the Midianites, but denies that his knowledge was mediated through his father-in-law.

Much has been written on the original meaning of the name "Yahweh." If our theory is correct, it is best to explain the name as a causative form of the verb "to be, to exist", with the meaning "Sustainer of X"—X being the name of the ancestor of Moses to whom this deity first revealed himself¹⁾. Moses' experience with Yahweh at the burning bush was perhaps not his first knowledge of his ancestor's patron deity, but in that encounter Yahweh, "the god of his father", was revealed anew to him in great power. When Moses went back to Egypt to deliver the Hebrews from bondage, he did not go in the name and under the power of a deity wholly unknown to the Hebrews in Egypt. His fellow-Hebrews probably would not have followed his leadership if he had come in the name of a wholly new and foreign deity. Yahweh had been known for some time to a part of the Hebrew group, to Moses' own clan, who had inherited the cult of Yahweh from one of their ancestors.

¹⁾ Cf. Julian OBERMANN, "The Divine Name *YHWH* in the Light of Recent Discoveries", *JBL*, LXVIII, 1949, 301-23. I do not intend to imply that I agree with OBERMANN in his explanation of the name as a participle. Cf. G. R. DRIVER, *JBL*, LXXIII, 1954, 125-31.

UN MYTHE ZERVANITE DANS UN DES MANUSCRITS DE QUMRÂN

PAR

HENRI MICHAUD

Paris

Ces lignes ont pour but de rapprocher un passage des manuscrits de Qumrân, 1 QS iii 12-iv 26, d'un paragraphe de Plutarque tiré du *De Iside et Osiride*, le paragraphe 47, dans lequel est exposé un mythe iranien relatif à l'origine, au cours et à la fin des choses. L'influence iranienne sur les doctrines des sectaires de Qumrân a déjà été décelée par plusieurs savants; à l'occasion de ces diverses recherches, le texte de Plutarque a été cité, mais par bribes et comme un témoin du zoroastrisme authentique. Nous aimerions montrer ici que la comparaison entre les deux textes peut être établie d'une manière à peu très continue et que l'un et l'autre, chacun à sa manière, suivent le schéma d'un mythe iranien dont nous aurons à déterminer la tendance théologique. Nous serons ainsi amenés à préciser l'influence iranienne qui s'est exercée sur la pensée des moines du désert de Juda.

LE TEXTE DE PLUTARQUE

Nous utilisons les éditions suivantes:

- 1) Carolus CLEMEN, *Fontes historiae religionis persicae*, Bonn 1920, fascicule 1 de la collection „Fontes historiae religionum”, pp. 48-49.
- 2) J. BIDEZ et F. CUMONT, *Les mages hellénisés*, II, Paris 1938, pp. 70-72.

Au § 46, après avoir rapporté que certains mages attribuent égale puissance aux deux divinités antagonistes, celle du bien et celle du mal, Plutarque retrace la conception de ceux qui, comme Zoroastre, accordent suprématie à la divinité du bien, Hôromazès (Ahura Mazda), sur celle du mal, Areimanios (Agra Mainyu), et le rang de médiateur (μεσίτης) à Mithra. A Hôromazès ils offrent vœux et actions de grâce, à Areimanios ils offrent des sacrifices propitiatoires et sinistres (ἀποτρόπαια καὶ σχυθρῶπά). Plutarque décrit alors la libation de la plante ἔρωμι; le jus de la plante mêlé au sang d'un

loup est offert à Hadès et aux Ténèbres dans un lieu privé de soleil. Suit l'exposé de la division des plantes et des animaux entre les deux créations, celle d'Hôromazès et celle d'Areimanios.

Au § 47, Plutarque raconte deux mythes iraniens dont le second, qui ne nous intéresse pas ici, est expressément tiré de Théopompe qui écrivait au IV^e siècle avant Jésus-Christ. Le premier de ces mythes est aussi tiré d'une source ancienne qui n'est pas nommée; les uns ont cru que cette source était aussi Théopompe, d'autres ont pensé à Eudème de Rhodes ou à Eudoxe de Cnide. Peu nous importe le nom! L'essentiel est de savoir que le mythe iranien que nous découvrons chez Plutarque, repose sur des documents anciens pouvant remonter jusqu'au IV^e siècle avant notre ère. Voici ce que dit notre auteur ¹⁾: „Hôromazès, né de la plus pure lumière, et Areimanios, né des ténèbres, se livrent combat l'un à l'autre. Hôromazès créa six dieux, le premier, dieu de la bienveillance, le second, dieu de la vérité, le troisième, dieu de la justice, et parmi les autres, le dieu de la sagesse, le dieu de la richesse et le dieu qui crée les délices qu'on recevra en récompense des bonnes oeuvres ²⁾; l'autre (Areimanios) créa le même nombre de divinités qui étaient comme des antagonistes. Puis Hôromazès, s'étant dilaté jusqu'à devenir trois fois plus grand qu'auparavant, s'éloigna du soleil autant que le soleil est éloigné de la terre, et para le ciel d'étoiles; une de ces dernières, Sirius, il la plaça devant toutes les autres afin de les garder et de les prévenir ³⁾. Ensuite il créa vingt-quatre autres dieux et les plaça dans un oeuf ⁴⁾. Ceux qui étaient nés d'Areimanios, étant en nombre égal à ceux-là, percèrent l'oeuf [. . . ici une lacune dans le texte. . .] d'où provient que les mauvaises choses ont été mêlées aux bonnes. Mais ensuite viendra un temps déterminé (χρόνος εἰμαρμένος) durant lequel cet Areimanios porteur de peste et de famine, doit de toute nécessité être entièrement détruit et anéanti par ceux-là (les êtres ahuriens); la terre deviendra unie et égale; les hommes, heureux et parlant la même langue, mèneront tous la même vie et formeront une seule communauté (πολιτεία).”

¹⁾ Nous nous inspirons de la traduction française donné par H. S. NYBERG dans le JA 1931 (219), pp. 223 et 233, quitte à la préciser sur certains points.

²⁾ Il s'agit des six amēša spenta, comme l'a démontré H. S. NYBERG, JA 1931 (219), p. 223-224 et Die Religionen des alten Iran, Leipzig 1938, pp. 392-393.

³⁾ Cette indication correspond à la division du ciel en trois régions; voir E. BENVENISTE, The Persian Religion according to the chief Greek Texts, Paris 1929, pp. 95-98. Pour la place privilégiée donnée à Sirius, voir *ibidem*, pp. 98-100.

⁴⁾ Le nombre 24 est propre au zervanisme, en rapport avec les douze signes du zodiaque, BENVENISTE, *ibid*, p. 104. Le monde est comparé à un oeuf dans un traité d'inspiration zervanite, *ibid*, p. 101.

Dans la première phrase de ce mythe sont présentés les protagonistes et expliqués leurs rapports: Hôromazès et Areïmanios se combattent. Remarquons que de chacun d'eux il nous est dit qu'il est né (γενώας), l'un de la lumière, l'autre des ténèbres; un tel détail se comprend pour Areïmanios qui, en tant que mauvais esprit, a pour père Ahura Mazda dans la doctrine zoroastrienne, bien qu'ici il ait pour père les ténèbres; mais le même détail ne se comprend plus du tout, appliqué à Hôromazès; si ce dieu est né, il lui faut un père; or, comme il est le plus grand dieu du zoroastrisme, comment expliquer qu'ici il dépende d'autre chose que de lui-même? Il n'y a qu'une solution à cette difficulté, les deux protagonistes devaient être subordonnés à une puissance qui leur était supérieure ¹⁾.

Après la présentation des adversaires, le mythe peut se lire comme une sorte de triptyque: création, mélange, restauration (*JA* 1931 (219), p. 233).

- 1) Création: création des six ameša spenta;
création antagoniste par Areïmanios;
dilatation d'Hôromazès, parure du ciel et disposition de Sirius;
création de vingt-quatre dieux; ceux-ci sont mis dans un oeuf.
- 2) Mélange: La création mauvaise se lance à l'assaut de la création bonne;
l'oeuf est percé; c'est le mélange du bien et du mal tel qu'on peut le constater dans le monde présent.
- 3) Restauration: C'est la partie eschatologique du mythe: Areïmanios est détruit au temps *fixé* et le bonheur s'installe sur la terre transformée; les justes ne parleront plus qu'une seule langue et formeront une communauté unique.

LE TEXTE DE 1 Q s iii 12-iv 26 ²⁾

Notons qu'il n'est pas dans notre intention de rechercher l'arrangement littéraire et le plan des lignes du manuscrit, mais bien de retrouver, sous le vêtement moralisateur, le schéma du mythe iranien que

¹⁾ Voir déjà BENVENISTE, *ibid.*, p. 81.

²⁾ Nous utilisons le texte édité par Millar BURROWS, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*, volume II, fascicule 2, New Haven 1951. Une traduction française du passage que nous étudions, a été donnée dans la *RHR* 1952, pp. 7-12.

nous venons d'analyser. En effet, nous pouvons a priori nous attendre à ce que le mythe iranien, s'il a inspiré l'auteur juif, ait été adapté au monothéisme intransigeant d'Israël et moralisé, puisque notre passage constitue une instruction théologique destinée à de futurs ascètes.

Nous retrouvons d'abord les deux antagonistes, abaissés du rang de divinités à celui de prince et d'ange, „le prince des lumières” et „l'ange des ténèbres”. Voici les textes:

„En la main du prince des lumières [est] la domination de tous les fils de la justice.” iii 20. L'expression *šr 'wrym*, prince des lumières, à ma connaissance, ne se rencontre qu'ici dans les manuscrits déjà publiés. Dans un des psaumes de la secte (SUKENIK, *Mgyhwt gnuwzwt*, II, planche X, ligne 8), l'expression *šr 'lym* s'applique sans conteste à Dieu: „Voici, tu es le prince des dieux . . .”. Il ressort de cette comparaison des citations que le premier des antagonistes, bien qu'il ne soit pas au rang de Dieu, a eu une stature divine.

„Mais en la main de l'ange des ténèbres [est] toute la domination des fils de la perversité.” iii 20-21. L'expression *ml'k hwske*, ange des ténèbres, se trouve une seconde fois à la suite du passage que nous venons de citer. Le même terme *ml'k* est appliqué en iii 24 au coadjuteur de Dieu: „Le Dieu d'Israël et son ange véridique, *ml'k 'mtw*.” Les coadjuteurs du mal sont appelés en iv 12: *ml'ky hbl*, les anges [qui procurent] la souffrance. De la présente confrontation de quelques citations nous pouvons tirer la conclusion suivante: l'ange n'a que le rang d'émissaire d'une puissance supérieure. Or cette distinction entre prince et envoyé ou ange, n'est-elle pas celle, la correspondance des termes mise à part, que Plutarque établit au § 46 lorsqu'il appelle Hôromazès, θεός, dieu, et Arcimanius, δαίμων, puissance subordonnée? L'association des deux antagonistes, l'un avec la lumière, l'autre avec les ténèbres, est trop flagrante pour que nous y insistions. Les rapports des deux entités sont aussi ceux de combattants: „Il (Dieu) a placé une éternelle inimitié entre leurs divisions (celles des hommes entre l'esprit de vérité et de perversité). . . une passion rivale (est) sur tous leurs jugements (les jugements de ceux qui appartiennent à chacun de ces esprits), car ils (les esprits) ne vont pas ensemble!” iv 17-18. „Jusqu'à présent les esprits de vérité et de perversité sont en rivalité dans le coeur humain.” iv 23. Le thème du combat ressort aussi de l'étude d'ensemble du manuscrit: c'est pour lutter contre le mal que les ascètes se vouent à une vie pieuse. De même que les deux protagonistes du mythe iranien étaient subordonnés à une puissance supérieure, de même aussi les deux entités opposées, à chacune desquelles se rattache un des deux esprits qui

marquent les hommes, dépendent du „*Dieu omniscient*” (iii 15) assimilé plus loin au „*Dieu d’Israël*” (iii 24). Camouflés, mais non pas dépouillés de tous leurs titres, nous venons de retrouver dans le texte de Qumrân, les protagonistes du mythe iranien, les uns et les autres soumis à un pouvoir dominateur.

Nous allons maintenant rechercher dans le texte hébreu, les trois principaux moments du mythe iranien: la création, le mélange, la restauration. Rappelons, encore une fois, que la moralisation du mythe, donne un tour particulier à chacune des parties du triptyque. L’auteur juif prêche plus qu’il n’expose un système, aussi est-il inévitable que le plan du triptyque en soit un peu bouleversé.

La création.

Après un préambule qui va de la ligne 12 au début de la ligne 15 de la 3ème colonne, la création est expliquée au moyen de la doctrine de la prédestination absolue et comme une création continuée, des choses et de l’homme: „*Du Dieu omniscient [vient] tout ce qui est et sera. Avant que ces choses ne soient, Il avait préparé tout leur plan, et lorsqu’elles existèrent pour rendre leur témoignage conformément à Son glorieux dessein, elles accomplirent leur oeuvre et rien n’est à changer; en Sa main [sont] les lois de toutes choses et Il soutient celles-ci dans toutes leurs destinations. Il (Dieu) a créé l’homme pour la domination du monde et lui a assigné deux esprits suivant lesquels se conduire jusqu’à la solennité de Sa visitation; ce sont les esprits de la vérité et de la perversité; dans la source de la lumière [sont] les lignées de la vérité, mais du jaillissement des ténèbres [sortent] les lignées de la perversité.*” iii 15-19. Jusqu’à la ligne 21 c’est encore le thème de la création qui est traité; à la ligne 25, à la fin d’un autre thème, revient une phrase relative à la création: „*C’est lui qui a créé les esprit de lumière et de ténèbres.*” Ainsi, il y a une création bonne et une création opposée, la création perverse.

Le trait relatif à la dilatation d’Hôromazès, tout rempli d’intérêt cosmologique, ne se retrouve pas ici; le monothéisme a laissé tomber ce détail; cependant, la secte de Qumrân a conservé le plus grand intérêt pour la science du ciel dont dépend son calendrier particulier chanté dans le psaume final du manuscrit ¹⁾.

La création des vingt-quatre dieux se reflète peut-être encore dans

¹⁾ Dans la doctrine zervanite les douze signes du zodiaque sont les généraux d’Ormuzd et les sept planètes ceux d’Ahriman; voir *Mênôkê xrat*, chp. 8, JA 1929 (214), p. 199, bas de la page.

l'énumération des vertus que crée dans le juste l'esprit de vérité (iv 3-8), vertus contrebalancées chez l'impie par autant de défauts énumérés dans le passage suivant (iv 9-11)¹. L'opposition des créations est déjà chez Plutarque, puisqu'Areimanios crée un nombre de divinités égal au nombre des créatures d'Hôromazès, une fois six, une fois vingt-quatre. Ces chiffres qui avaient leur importance dans le mythe iranien, on perdu toute signification dans la doctrine monothéiste des sectaires, du moins sous le manteau moralisateur que le mythe a revêtu. Le caractère moral du passage exclut la comparaison du monde avec un oeuf.

Le mélange.

Le thème bien caractéristique du mélange en ce monde du bien et du mal, se retrouve dans le passage hébreu et, comme dans le mythe iranien, le mélange est la conséquence de l'attaque lancée par les puissances mauvaises contre la bonne création; le passage hébreu est le suivant: iii 21-25; le tour moral de ce passage est évident; il s'agissait d'expliquer pourquoi les justes péchaient encore; la réponse était facile, c'était à cause du mélange du bien et du mal: „*De l'ange des ténèbres [viennent] les errements de tous les fils de la justice; tous leurs péchés, leurs offenses, leurs crimes et leurs oeuvres transgressives [se font] sous sa domination suivant les mystères de Dieu jusqu'à Son temps final.*” iii 21-23. Deux autres passages se rapportent aussi à ce même thème: le premier, iv 23-26, que nous avons déjà cité en partie, est une digression morale relative aux effets actuels du mélange; le second, iv 19-20, est une phrase incorporée dans le développement du thème suivant, mais qui ne s'explique que par l'idée du mélange: „*Alors la vérité universelle sortira, car elle se roule dans les voies de l'impiété sous l'empire de la perversion jusqu'à l'époque du jugement décisif.*”

La restauration.

Ce thème eschatologique est ici fortement exprimé; il est contenu dans le passage iv 17-23. En voici une partie remarquable: „*Dieu, dans les mystères de sa prescience et dans sa glorieuse sagesse, a fixé un temps (ntn qš) pour qu'existe la perversité, mais lors de la solennité de la visitation il la détruira pour toujours.*” iv 18-19; ce passage rappelle presque littéralement le passage de Plutarque: „*Mais ensuite viendra un temps*

¹ La perversité opposée à la droiture, apparaît dans le mythe zervanite de la création contenu dans le premier chp. du *Bundahishn*, JA 1931 (219), pp. 38 et 40.

déterminé durant lequel cet Areimanios ... doit de toute nécessité être entièrement détruit et anéanti par ceux-là." *qš* a le sens de „temps”, de „moment déterminé”; avec une connotation eschatologique, ce mot est propre à la secte de Qumrân; *qš* est ici l'équivalent parfait de χρόνος εἰμαρμένως. A notre passage en hébreu, fait suite un petit morceau, iv 20-23, où l'on voit Dieu à l'oeuvre, purifiant les justes par Sa vérité; entendons que par l'esprit de vérité, Dieu lutte en l'homme jusqu'à l'exclusion hors du monde de la perversité. Ceux qui resteront seront ceux que „Dieu a élus pour une alliance éternelle; pour eux sera toute la gloire humaine; il n'y aura plus de perversité.” iv 22-23; voilà qui rappelle singulièrement l'eschatologie du mythe iranien d'après laquelle les justes forment un groupement uni et parlant la même langue après la destruction d'Areimanios. En v 5-6, la secte ne s'appelle-t-elle pas „Communauté de l'alliance éternelle”? En iii 11-12, ne parle-t-on pas de „l'alliance de la communauté éternelle”?

Ainsi nous avons retrouvé dans le passage hébreu le triple mouvement du mythe iranien; malgré des retours de pensée et des reprises de thème propres au style catéchétique, le mouvement du mythe demeure:

	thème principal	digression
1) Création	iii 15-21	iv 2-16
2) Mélange	iii 21-25	iv 23-26
3) Restauration	iv 17-23	

Il nous faut maintenant répondre à la question suivante:

QUELLE EST LA TENDANCE THEOLOGIQUE DU MYTHE IRANIEN RAPPORTÉ PAR PLUTARQUE?

Un certain nombre d'exégètes ont admis que Plutarque expose la théologie des mages de Cappadoce. Leur raisonnement reposait sur une correction textuelle; en effet, au § 46, on corrigeait *δμωμι*, nom d'une plante qu'on ne connaissait pas, en *μῶλυ*, nom d'une plante dans le dialecte cappadocien. Heureusement, E. BENVENISTE a délivré la science d'une correction inutile en proposant de voir dans la plante *δμωμι* une sorte d'amome¹⁾. Grâce à cette explication, nous pouvons affirmer que c'est bien la pensée des mages de l'Iran que nous révèle Plutarque²⁾.

Cependant, le camp des exégètes auquel nous venons de nous rallier,

¹⁾ „Un rite zervanite chez Plutarque”, *JA* 1929 (215), pp. 287-296.

²⁾ Voir BIDEZ-CUMONT, *ibid.*, II, p. 72.

n'est pas dans l'unité. Tous admettent que Plutarque expose la pensée des mages de l'Iran, mais ils se divisent quand il s'agit de rattacher cette pensée à l'un ou à l'autre des systèmes théologiques suivants : mazdéisme ou zervanisme.

E. BENVENISTE est le promoteur de la comparaison avec le zervanisme. Il a donné son point de vue dans les travaux dont voici les références :

— *The Persian Religion according to the chief Greek Texts*, Paris 1929, pp. 69-117.

— *JA* 1929 (215), pp. 287-296.

A. CHRISTENSEN a précisé quelques définitions dans *Le monde oriental* 1931 (25), pp. 29-34, „A-t-il existé une religion zurvânite?“, et E. BENVENISTE lui a répondu dans la même revue, 1932-1933 (26-27), pp. 170-215, „Le témoignage de Théodore bar Kônay sur le zoroastrisme“.

H. S. NYBERG, „Questions de cosmogonie et de cosmologie mazdéennes“, *JA* 1931 (219), pp. 223-225 et 233-239, rattache le mythe rapporté par Plutarque à la théologie mazdéenne orthodoxe et dans cette voie le suivent J. BIDEZ et F. CUMONT, *ibid*, I, pp. 65-66.

Nous adoptons la thèse présentée et défendue par E. BENVENISTE et nous nous permettons de renvoyer le lecteur aux démonstrations convaincantes qu'il a données et qui n'ont pas encore été démontrées fausses. Nous pensons donc que les § 46 et 47 du *De Iside et Osiride* de Plutarque décrivent une théologie zervanite; il s'ensuit que le mythe iranien contenu dans le § 47 est, lui aussi, d'inspiration zervanite comme tout le passage de Plutarque; n'y avons-nous pas souligné l'importance qu'y prend le „temps déterminé“, χρόνος εἰμαρμένος? Puisque le temps de la restauration n'est pas déterminé par l'un des deux antagonistes, par qui pourrait-il l'être si ce n'est par le sort, comme nous invite à le comprendre le terme grec, c'est-à-dire par le temps divinisé? Hôromazès et Areimanios soumis au Temps, n'est-ce pas là du zervanisme? On entend en effet par zervanisme, une tendance particulière au sein du zoroastrisme, laquelle fait de Zurvân, le temps (χρόνος), le père d'Hôromazès et d'Areimanios. C'est un effort de systématisation moniste qui maintient le dualisme et qui trouve la justification de sa position théologique dans un passage des Gâthâ, Yasna 30.3. Cette tendance zervanite remonte au moins jusqu'à l'époque achéménide; ce n'est qu'à l'époque sassanide qu'elle est classée au rang d'une hérésie, lorsque le zoroastrisme devient religion officielle d'un royaume. Le zervanisme n'est donc pas

une religion organisée, avec prêtres et rites, encore qu'elle ait connu des sacrifices propitiatoires adressés à Arcimanius.

AUTRES TRACES DE ZERVANISME DANS LE PASSAGE HÉBREU

Puisque nous avons retrouvé les éléments essentiels d'un mythe zervanite dans un des manuscrits de Qumrân, il s'ensuit que c'est au zervanisme qu'il faut attribuer l'influence iranienne qui s'est exercée sur la pensée des sectaires de Juda. Notre conclusion, loin d'exclure le zoroastrisme, précise qu'il s'agit d'une tendance particulière de celui-ci, le zervanisme, dont nous savons précisément qu'il s'est répandu à l'ouest de l'Iran; on consultera au sujet de l'expansion du zervanisme, E. BENVENISTE, „The Persian Religion”, pp. 116-117.

Voici par ailleurs quelques autres traces de zervanisme dans le morceau de Qumrân:

1) Nous lisons dans un texte pehlevi, *Mênôkê xrat*, au chp. 27. 8-13, traduction de H. S. NYBERG, *JA* 1929 (214), p. 203: „... toutes les affaires du monde matériel sont mises en branle par la Prédestination, le Moment et la Décision définitive, attributs essentiels de Zurvân ...”; voir aussi les chp. 22 et 23 du même texte, *ibid*, p. 205. Ces trois attributs de Zurvân, ne les avons nous pas retrouvés dans le passage hébreu, dépendant de Dieu, sous la forme suivante: la prédestination absolue (iii 15-17), le temps ou moment déterminé, *qš* (iv 18) et le jugement décisif (iv 20)? Rappelons-nous, le *χρόνος εἰμαρμένος* de Plutarque! S'il se vérifie que la secte de Qumrân est essénienne, Josèphe ne nous rapporte-t-il pas que les Esséniens attribuaient tout au Destin, *εἰμαρμένη*?

2) Dans le morceau en hébreu, iii 26-4.1, nous lisons: „Dieu a aimé l'un [des esprits] pour toute la durée des siècles et en tous ses agissements Il prend plaisir à toujours; de l'autre [esprit], Il a en abomination le secret et Il hait toutes ses voies à perpétuité.” D'ailleurs, les sentiments de Dieu règlent ceux des fidèles; ceux-ci doivent aimer le bien et haïr le mal. Mais qu'est-ce donc que ce Dieu qui hait ce qu'il a créé, qui hait un esprit qui procède de Lui?

Ce trait nous rappelle un trait d'un autre mythe, typiquement zervanite, rapporté par l'écrivain arménien Eznik de Kolb ¹⁾. Résumons d'abord le récit: Zrouan offre des sacrifices pendant mille ans

¹⁾ Traduction française par LE VAILLANT DE FLORIVAL, dans BIDEZ-CUMONT, II, 89-92.

pour avoir un fils. Un doute sur la valeur de ses sacrifices naît en son esprit. En vertu du sacrifice, Ormizd est conçu dans le sein de sa mère, Ahrmn l'est en même temps en vertu du doute. Suit une course des jumeaux pour l'obtention de la royauté. C'est alors qu'apparaît en Zrouan un dieu qui aime Ormizd et hait Ahrmn à qui cependant il doit accorder une temporaire royauté en vertu d'une promesse imprudente. Transcrivons le passage du dialogue entre Zrouan et Ahrmn, dans lequel se trouve le trait qui nous intéresse: „*Et Zrouan l'ayant vu (Ahrmn), ne sut pas qui il pouvait bien être; et il demandait: „Qui es-tu, toi?” Et celui-ci dit: „Je suis ton fils.” Zrouan lui dit: „Mon fils est parfumé et lumineux et toi tu es ténébreux et puant.”*” p. 90. Dans le récit arménien, le doute explique la naissance d'Ahrmn, sa puanteur et l'inimitié de Zrouan pour son fils; dans le texte hébreu, la raison de la haine de Dieu pour l'esprit de perversité a disparu.

3) Enfin, toujours selon Eznik de Kolb, Zrouan fixe un temps (9000 ans) au règne d'Ahrmn. Ce trait doit être comparé à celui-ci, tiré du passage hébreu: „*Dieu ... a fixé un temps pour qu'existe la perversité.*” iv 18.

CONCLUSIONS

L'auteur de l'instruction théologique de Qumrân, ou bien a connu un mythe zervanite expliquant la création, le mélange et la restauration des choses, ou bien il a été influencé par une pensée tout imprégnée de la structure de ce mythe. C'est parce que la pensée des sectaires de Qumrân a été influencée par le dualisme zervanite qu'on a pu lui trouver des parallèles aussi bien avec le zoroastrisme qu'avec le manichéisme. N'est-il pas admis de plus en plus que le manichéisme a pris beaucoup au zervanisme¹⁾? Le mélange du bien et du mal, non seulement dans le monde, mais encore en chaque homme tel qu'il est enseigné par l'auteur juif, a toutes raisons de provenir du zervanisme. Il va de soi que l'auteur juif, pour les besoins d'une communauté d'ascètes, a particulièrement insisté sur le mélange en la personne humaine. Il restera maintenant à déterminer, quand ce zervanisme a trouvé accès en Israël²⁾.

¹⁾ Voir *JA* 1929 (215), p. 294.

²⁾ Vu l'antiquité du zervanisme, il n'est pas exclu a priori que l'influence ait pu s'exercer sur les juifs emmenés en exil dans une région où devait se répandre cette théologie. Es. xlv 7 n'a-t-il pas été influencé par le zervanisme? H. S. NYBERG l'avait d'abord pensé, *JA* 1931 (219), p. 161, puis il a changé d'avis, *Die Religionen des alten Iran*, pp. 478-479. Le récit créateur de Genèse i, ne serait-il pas aussi à revoir?

Plutarque de son côté a dû avoir connaissance de sources ou d'une pensée identiques à celles qui ont influencé les membres de la communauté de Qumrân.

L'auteur juif a eu grande facilité pour incorporer la pensée zervanite à son monothéisme, puisque la pensée zervanite est essentiellement moniste. Ce qui l'a séduit, c'est que le dualisme tempéré qu'elle implique, lui permettait de rendre compte du bien et du mal, dans le monde comme en l'homme, tout en laissant à Dieu sa suprême puissance. Qu'un juif pieux ait rejeté la forme polythéiste du mythe, quoi de plus naturel? Il l'a fait en moralisant le mythe! L'être humain l'intéressait plus que le monde!

NOTES ON THE HABAKKUK SCROLL AND THE ZADOKITE DOCUMENTS

BY

C. RABIN

Oxford

(With a note by J. W. B. BARNES)

I. THE LITERARY GENRE OF THE HABAKKUK SCROLL

The discussions as to whether DSH is a midrash or a commentary have a certain lack of reality, since often neither side bothers to specify with which of the widely different types of midrash or the equally divergent types of commentary they are comparing our text. It does, of course, to some extent resemble the ethical and mystical commentaries of the later middle ages, but they do not try to apply scripture to contemporary history. Among midrashim, there is none which attempts the consistent application of a whole book to one set of historical events. The nearest parallels in early Jewish literature are some targums to the Five Megilloth, especially the Targum to Canticles, which sees in that poem a consistent account of the story of the Exodus, employing not infrequently a technique similar to that of DSH. Tg. Cant. is a comparatively late work, but may go back to an old tradition of interpretation. We might even go further and say that, just as the late (ca. 9th cent.) *Pirqe R. Eliezer* takes up ideas found in the Scrolls and in Jewish Gnosticism, so sectarian techniques of interpretation came back in the post-Islamic targumim. However, there is one essential difference: Tg. Cant. does not refer the text to its own time.

To find a more exact parallel, we have to go outside Jewish literature, to the Demotic writings of the early Ptolemaic period, about 300 B.C. In many ways that time was similar to the period of the Judean Scrolls—whichever dating we accept: Egypt smarted under a hated foreign rule, all the worse because the foreign power represented a brilliant civilization which attracted certain circles away from the ancestral faith. The people hoped for a Messiah who would restore

both national independence and the proper way of life. To this period belongs a document which was published in a definitive edition by W. SPIEGELBERG under the title *Die sogenannte Demotische Chronik* (Leipzig 1914) and analysed by ED. MEYER in 1915 („Aegyptische Dokumente aus der Perserzeit”, *Sitzungsberichte d. kgl. preuss. Ak. d. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl.*, XVI, 287-311)¹).

The title, “chronicle”, under which this writing generally goes, is a misnomer, but is worth keeping on for convenience’ sake, like “Zadokite Documents” for CDC. The text consists of a series of oracles, most of which in themselves make little sense (the same as parts of Habakkuk), interpreted, sentence by sentence, as an account of the last native rulers of Egypt (404-341 B.C.), the foreign domination, and the future redemption. The interpreter finds in his source two such accounts, a short one (ii 1-iii 16) and a longer one (iii 17-vi 22) in which the same names and events are, according to his view, hinted at. This seems to me a clear proof that the oracles did not refer to the events in question²). The author of DSH, too, had to break off and restart his train of thought, because even with his ingenuity he could not follow them through the whole of Habakkuk. As in DSH, so in the Demotic Chronicle, foreign nations are named (Ionians and Medes) but not their individual rulers. The past pharaohs are named, but the future redeemer is not.

The following extract (v 2-4) must suffice to show the general similarity in technique. It should be compared particularly with DSH xii 3-4, translated below, par. 4.

“Rain upon the stone, the sky being clear”. That means: the people of Egypt have been made a carnage while the sun(god) sees them. *bi.t* is the sun(god). He has said “the sky being clear”, meaning: the sun(god) sees them. He has said: “rain (*hui*) on the stone”, meaning: people are hurled (*hue*) into carnage. “Water” (*mw*) is people (*rm*). “The stone” (*ne*) is carnage (*b*’).

The manner in which the interpretations are set out agrees with DSH to an extent which seems to exclude accident, e.g. in the use of a variety of introductory formulae which apparently indicate subtle shades of appropriateness. Particularly significant is the way in which both point out cases of particularly good “fit”—in DSH

¹) See also F. K. KIENITZ, *Die politische Geschichte Aegyptens vom 7. bis 4. Jahrhundert*, Berlin 1953, pp. 136-9.

²) W. VON WESSETZKY (*W.Z.K.M.* 49, 1942; pp. 161-71) identified the “oracles” as list of data on the Nile inundations in mythological disguise.

with the phrase *kī bū āsher āmar*, "for this is what he means by saying"¹⁾—the purpose being, of course, to increase the reader's faith in the interpretation as a whole by drawing attention to its highlights.

It seems that everything points to a literary connection. It is obvious that literary contacts between Egypt and Judaea existed in the Second Temple period; the snippets of Egyptian wisdom in Ben Sira bear witness to this. The question is: was this merely migration of a "form", or did this form come to Judaea with a similar "Sitz im Leben", or in other words, did Egyptian Messianism influence our sect, and bring its typical form of exposition with it? Egypt was a centre of Gnostic thought, and Gnosticism pervades the thought of our sect. Messianism, of course, was a native Jewish product, but may have been influenced in form.

It is interesting to note that MEYER (*op. cit.*, p. 299) was struck by the similarity of outlook between the Demotic Chronicle and the Deuteronomistic historical works and the Book of Chronicles, with regard to the importance of the Law (*p' hp*; also *t' my.t p' ntr*, "the way of God", cf. CDC xx 18). It is hardly necessary to point out that the Law holds an even more central position in the thought of the Qumran sect. Even the valuation of kings according to their attitude to the Law, which seems to establish a specially close contact with the book of Kings, is paralleled in DSH. Cf. DSH viii 8: "the wicked priest who called himself by the name of Truth when he first took office, but when he had power over Israel his heart grew proud, and he forsook God", with the Demotic Chronicle iv 9: "Hakorīs, lord of diadems, whose rule was made full because he was generous to the temples. He fell because he forsook the Law and did not care for his brothers."

The literary genre of both these writings is not covered by either "midrash" or "commentary". We may follow the habit already established by scholars writing in Hebrew and call it "pesher".

The pesher is, on its own definition (DSH ii 8-9) of an inspired nature, a revelation of the inner meaning of ancient writings which was not known even to those "by the hand" of whom (CDC xix 7; DSH ii 9) God had communicated those writings. The general correspondence, more or less close, between words in the text and elements in the interpretation, and the plays on words²⁾, belong to

¹⁾ This does not necessarily contradict the results of the discussion of this phrase by BURROWS, *V.T.* 2, 1952, pp. 255-60.

²⁾ The play on words may perhaps originally have come from the technique

a rhetorical tradition and are not in themselves meant as proof of the veracity of the explanations.

The part of CDC which I have called the Admonition (DSA)¹⁾ does not follow the pesher method in its strict form. Its explanations are drawn up in such a way as to recommend themselves logically as the correct estimate of the meaning of the passages to which they refer, especially when this is done by the thoroughly "modern" method of bringing different verses to throw light upon each other, or in some cases turning a verse round in order to bring out more clearly its significance. Indeed, one is "occasionally plagued by doubts whether the true interpretation of certain passages may not after all be found here"²⁾. In all these features the Admonition approaches more closely the character of a midrash than does DSH. Significantly, the word *pesher* is used only once in DSA (iv 14), where the interpretation, taken from an ancient writing, is of the oracular variety.

Two interpretations of this relationship between the two works are possible. One is that DSH is an exceptional work—due perhaps to foreign influence—and DSA is part of the main stream of midrash literature, adapted to sectarian needs. This fits the common view that midrash is an organic development going back to early post-exilic, perhaps even pre-exilic, times. The other explanation would be that DSA—generally admitted to be somewhat later than DSH—shows a development of the method employed in DSH, and thus lies somehow at the beginning of midrash literature. When we talk of midrash in this connection, we mean above all works of the type of Genesis Rabba. As is well known, the latter is much preoccupied with controversy against gnostics. There would be nothing strange if it had also adapted some of the methods of exposition used by the gnostic circles.

A Note on the Egyptian Background of the "Demotic Chronicle"

By J. W. B. BARNS

This type of literature has many partial parallels, some of which are far older. Explanatory glosses on obscure texts are of great antiquity in Egypt. The EBERS Medical Papyrus, an early 18th dynasty

of interpretation of dreams. Cf., for the Egyptian field, A. VOLTEN, *Demotische Traumdeutung* Copenhagen 1942, pp. 63-4; for the Hebrew field such interpretations of visions as Jer. i 11-12.

¹⁾ *The Zadokite Documents* Oxford 1954, p. x.

²⁾ Said by D. NEUMARK of the Zohar, cf. G. SCHOLEM, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* 2nd ed., p. 158.

MS of a far older work, contains, beside medical prescriptions, a number of glosses and explanations of obscure medical terms. Religious texts such as the *Book of the Dead* were felt to require similar interpretation; see H. GRAPOW, *Religiöse Urkunden* (= Urk. V), passim, for early examples. Plays on words such as we find in the extract quoted here are a commonplace of Egyptian style; see, for instance, the narrative Edfu texts translated by FAIRMAN, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 1935, XXI, 26-36.

II. VARIANT READINGS IN HABAKKUK ii 5

The MT in Hab. ii 5 gives little sense, and only with violence to grammar. Most emendations attempt to get rid of *ha-yayin*, supported only by Tg. and Vulg. among the versions, though a further, and considerably older, piece of evidence for it may be Sir. xxxi 25 וּגַם עַל הַיַּיִן אֵל תַּתְּנוּבָר "moreover in wine do not show your manhood", which seems to be derived from this, rather than from Is. v 22.

In the text of DSH viii 3, we read instead הוֹן, with the second *yodh* seemingly displaced before the next word, *yivgōdh* for MT *bōghēdh*. That the word is not merely *ha-yayin* with haplography¹), but was read *hōn* "wealth", is made quite clear by the interpretation in lines 10-11: "and he betrayed the laws for the sake of wealth, and he made unlawful acquisitions and gathered the wealth of men of violence".

If we introduce into this the verb which appears in the Sir. quotation, we find that CDC viii 7 also quotes the verse with *hōn*: וַיִּתְּנוּבָר וְלִהְיוֹן.

This provides us with a new approach to the LXX rendering: we see that *katoimenos*, the only reading attested by tradition, need not be changed, with RAHLFS, to *katoinōmenos* or *kai oinōmenos*²). It is a translation of *mithgabber* in the wrong place, while *kai kataphronētēs* renders *u-vōghēdh*, i.e., if we assume a ductus similar to that of the Scrolls, the same written image as DSH; *ha-yayin* has fallen out.

In the Peshitta, not only has *ha-yayin* disappeared, but the first six words of MT are represented by "and the presumptuous and covetous man". It is, however, just possible that, if *marrāhā* "presumptu-

¹) On the tendency of both copyists of DSIa to haplography, see W. J. MARTIN, *The Dead Sea Scroll of Isaiah* 1954, p. 13-4.

²) Cf. the discussion on this between P. JUNG (*Biblica* 32, 1951, pp. 564-6) and J. ZIEGLER (*ib.*, 33, 1952, 366-70).

ous" stands for *yāhîr*, then *ya'nā* "covetous" may somehow express *mithgabbēr lē-bôn*.

There were thus two primary variants: הָק וְיִי בָגַד and הָק וְיִי בָגַד, with a secondary variation between בָּגַד and מִתְגַּבֵּר¹), and the different texts and versions selected from these as best they could.

It seems that both *bôn* and *ba-yayin* are corrupt readings. After *af kē* one would expect a clause beginning with a verb. I would suggest that the original form of the word was הָק "made light, was presumptuous", cf. Dt. i 41²), followed by *bôghēdh* or *mithgabbēr*. The sense would then be:

"Even though the faithless one (or: the one who shows his might) makes light of things, being a proud man, yet he shall not dwell safely; in so far as he made his gullet wide as Sheol, yet, like death, he shall not be sated".

I believe one can even show how the first *he* was discarded. In an insufficiently spaced text, a scribe must have thought that his predecessor wrote הָק כִּי־אֵהָיָה, by wrong analogy to הִיאֵהָ. In this way the reading *bôn* came into being, though both it and *ba-yayin* may simply be midrashic attempts to extract a moral from the verse.

III. LXX READINGS IN DSH

a) Corresponding to MT *u-mōreh sheqer* Hab. ii 18, DSH xii 11 has שָׂקֶר וּמְרִי. ELLIGER (*Studien zum Hab. Kommentar*, p. 224) takes this as a misspelling³) of *mōreh*. VAN 'T LAND and VAN DER WOUDE (*De Hab.-rol van Ain Fašḥa*) seem to think the same, as they simply render it "teacher of lies". HABERMANN (*Edah wē-Eduth*, p. 56) points *u-mārē*, but does not say what it means.

Had the interpreter of DSH known the reading *mōreh*, he would hardly have missed the opportunity of pointing out to his readers the wickedness of the "Preacher of Lies".

None of the ancient versions has "teacher". Even the Peshitta has only *yulpānā* "teaching". The LXX and the Vulgate (*phantasian*, *maginem*) clearly read *mar'eh*. The Targum read *mōrā* "fear" = "object of worship"⁴), thus also a word with *aleph*.

¹) This may be the original reading. If not, then it is possible that it came in from Is. v 22—though this does not entitle us to reshape the whole Hab. passage after Is., as was done by M. STENZEL (*Biblica* 33, 1952, p. 510).

²) Note that in vs. 43 *wattazjdhū* appears with the same meaning, and that *zēdh* and *bôghēdh* are practically synonyms.

³) Or we should rather say, a spelling permissible in the orthography of the Scrolls, cf. GOTTSTEIN, *J.J.S.* 4, 1953, p. 104.

⁴) The word is used in this sense DSH vi 5.

Mar'eh certainly provides a better reading. The DSH's spelling no doubt represents the same word, with omission of the *aleph*. Such omission of *aleph* is not rare in MT¹⁾. Our instance shows that it may have been even more frequent, but some cases were masked by subsequent emendation.

Another fairly certain case of a MT emendation in Hab. is i 9, where the DSH interpretation (iii 11-14), with its insistence on burning anger, demonstrates clearly that its author took *qādhīm* (his reading in line 9) to mean "burning wind", just as did Symmachus, the Sahidic version, the Targum, and probably the Peshitta²⁾. Once, however, the word was understood to mean "east", the slight change into MT *qādhīmāh* naturally suggested itself, producing what W. H. WARD (*I. C. C.*, p. 9) calls "an untranslatable intrusion."

It is certainly remarkable that in both cases readings have arisen which fit in better with the whole thought of DSH than those of DSH itself. The Chaldaeans or Scythians did not move "eastwards", but the Romans did, and the value of *mōrēh sheqer* in Hab. to a sectarian is obvious. It may be accident, but is it not just possible that such readings were transmitted and preserved by people cherishing interpretations in the spirit of the Qumran sect?

As a contribution to the interpretation of Habakkuk i 9, I should like to draw attention to the existence of a root *gmm* "to absorb fluid" in Arabic, e.g. C. DE LANDBERG, *Glossaire Dathinois I* (Leiden 1920), p. 298: "*jamm*, s'imbiber d'eau, absorber l'eau (champ), boire en général". In a Hadith³⁾ we are told that gruel is *majamma*⁴⁾ for the heart and bowels (*fu'ād*) of a sick person, i.e. it fills and restores these organs. The phrase *jamūm an-nashāṭ* means "filled with energy"⁵⁾. One might therefore render *mēghammath pēnēhem qādhīm*: "their faces are sappy with burning wind".

b) Of quite a different character is the reading רומה DSH xii 15 for MT דומם in Hab. ii 19. It is not necessary to read this *dūmāh*, as do HABERMANN, ELLIGER, and VAN 'T LAND — VAN DER WOUDE. That word occurs in the O.T. only as a noun, and it is most doubtful whether it has anything to do with "silence"⁶⁾. Although two words

¹⁾ Cf. GESENIUS-KAUTZSCH, par. 23f.

²⁾ The word is taken in this sense by DELCOR and LAMBERT.

³⁾ Bukhari, *Aḥīma* 24, also in TORREY's *Selections from the Ṣaḥīḥ*, p. 6 line 9.

⁴⁾ For this pointing, see Qastallani's comm., VIII, 228.

⁵⁾ Cf. on this W. P. DE HAAS, *The Semantic Spectrum of Moisture in Arabic*, s²-Gravenhage 1954, p. 99.

⁶⁾ *Dūmāh*, Ps. xciv 17 and cxv 17 seems from the context to mean "Hades" (sc

are missing in the MS, the real sense of the DSH reading can be established by reference to the versions. As against the division of MT:

“who says to wood ‘wake up’, ‘arise’ to a silent stone”, the LXX divides:

“who says to wood ‘wake up (and) ¹ arise’, (and) ² to stone ‘raise thyself’”. Clearly, LXX read *rūmāh*, and this is the reading of DSH; the latter may even have had “and” before “stone” in the lost portion.

Targum and Peshitta agree with MT, but place “arise” after “a silent stone”, thus making the construction clearer.

c) Corresponding to MT in Hab. ii 15, *mēsappēah ḥāmathkbā*, DSH xi 2-3 has *מספה חמתו*. With regard to the pronoun, DSH agrees with Symmachus and the Vulgate; Aquilas, Theodotion, and Quinta agree with MT; LXX, Targum, and Peshitta lack the possessive pronoun.

The second word is translated “wrath” in all versions, except the Vulgate, whose *fel* means both “wrath” and “poison”, and the Targum, which has the hapax legomenon *yaḥmā*³), apparently chosen as an etymological equivalent so as to avoid resolving the ambiguity⁴).

The first word is taken as a verb by Targum (“and pours”), Symmachus (“letting go wildly”), and Vulgate (“pouring”). The other versions read here a noun: LXX translates “turbidness”, Aquilas “a hurling”, Theodotion “an outpouring”, Quinta “sudden upheaval”, Peshitta “dregs”. Aq., Th., Qu. interpose the preposition “from”, i.e. they took the noun to be **sefah*, the others apparently read it as

LXX, Vulg., Jerome *Juxta Hebr.* in xciv), but this is of course a mere guess, as is probably “burial-place in the earth” (Tg. in cxv). Ibn Ezra’s “place of extermination” is his own speculation, but may be influenced by Tg., since he identifies it with the tomb, not Hades. The desire to find an etymology, while retaining the meaning “Hades”, leads to assumption of a root *dwm* = *dmm*, *dmy*, and meaning “stillness” (so Tg. in xciv, Jerome *Juxta Heb.* in cxv, Rashi). The only rendering which cannot be explained as guesswork is the Peshitta’s “wretchedness” in xciv and “darkness” in cxv. Accadian *da’ummatu* has both meanings, so has Arabic *dbm* in *duhmah* “black colour”, *dubaimā* “misfortune”. The roots *dbm* and *dwm* are then related like Heb. *bwsb*—Aram. *bbt*, Eth. *nōl-āwī* “shepherd”—Heb. *nbl*, etc.

¹) Lucianic tradition, versions.

²) All except Sin^o, Catenae, Syroh.

³) Cod. Reuchlinianus has *נמח*, and as an alternative marginal reading *ḥamar* “wine”, cf. LAGARDE, *Prophetiae Chaldaice*, p. 468 and p. XLI.

⁴) Otherwise *ḥ*. = “wrath” is in Tg. *tēqōf*, *ḥ*. = “poison” (not elsewhere in Prophets) is *ērśā*.

**mišpāḥ*. This latter form reminds us of *mišpāḥ* in Is. v 7, translated by all versions as "injustice", except by Aquilas. What he wrote we know only from Jerome's vague rendering *dissipatio*, but it is almost certain that this does not represent *epirripsis*, the word Aq. uses in Hab., since nowhere in the Vulgate does *epirriptein* appear as *dissipare*.

DSH interprets its reading by the words *lē-vallē'ō bē-keha'as ḥāmāthō* (lines 5-6). This leaves it open whether the interpreter read *mēsap-pēah* or *mišpāḥ*. *Ka'as* is an explanatory addition to define *ḥāmāthō*, so as to reject the meaning "poison". Line 7-8 shows that the author of DSH used *bl'* Piel meaning "to upset, disturb", as it is used in Is. xix 3 (LXX: "I shall scatter" ¹⁾) and Ps. lv 10 (LXX: "cause to sink"), etc. The meaning attributed to *spḥ* agrees therefore most closely with the Quinta, and possibly with *aellē* "whirlwind", quoted by Jerome from an *editio altera*.

Accadian *sapāḫu* "scatter, destroy", gives us just the right range of meaning. Whichever form we read in Hab., "turbid poison" obviously makes good sense. In Is. v 7, "confusion" as a translation of *mišpāḥ* is etymologically at least as well founded as "bloodshed" (B.D.B.) or "law-breaking" (KOEHLER); it forms an antithesis to *mishpāt* meaning "the proper order of doing things".

This is *spḥ* II of B.D.B., *spḥ* III of KOEHLER, the basic meaning being "to scatter", then "to make turbid", "to confuse". The Arabic cognate is apparently *safaḥa*, in spite of the disagreement in the guttural with Accadian (perhaps due to the neighbouring labial), since it not only means "to pour", but the sense of "scattering" is still alive in *saffāḥ* "generous", *saffaḥa* "to work without profit", and *safīḥ* "one of the non-counting arrows in the Maisir game".

The same verse is quoted also in DST (*Megilloth Genuzoth* II, p. 44, lines 7-9; as noticed already by YALON, *Kiriath Sefer* 26 (1950), 247): "so as to look on at their going astray by behaving senselessly about their festivals, thus being caught in their nets". This clearly bears out the contention of S. TALMON (*Biblica* 32 (1951), 553-4) that the DSH passage refers to differences concerning the dates of (and perhaps also the manner of celebrating) the religious festivals. The subject of "to look on" is in DST "preachers of lies".

IV. DSH AND THE TARGUM

In *J.J.S.* 4 (1953) 14-18, N. WIEDER proved the existence of con-

¹⁾ Vulg. *praecipitabo*, but possibly the equation *bl'*—*spḥ* led to Aquilas' translation *dissipatio* in Is. v 7.

tacts between DSH and the Targum to the Prophets. In that case, the Targum had what is apparently the original form of a midrashic equation, while the Scroll had transformed the equation for its own purposes. In the instance to be discussed here, it is the Targum which has "spoilt" the equation.

The lemma for DSH xii 1-5, namely, Hab. ii 17a, is lost, but the interpretation makes it clear that the text was identical with MT:

[“Because the violence of Lebanon shall cover thee, and the robbery of the beasts shall . . . ¹⁾”]. The interpretation of the word is concerning the Wicked Priest, to requite him for his treatment of poor men ²⁾; for the Lebanon is the council of the community, and the Beasts are the simple ones of Judah, the doers of the Law.”

The relation between “Judah” and the group from which DSH emanated is not clear. In my edition of the Zadokite Documents (p. 15) I adduced reasons for taking “Judah” as the name of a distinct but related group. Major-General Y. YADIN, in a letter, pointed out that most of the passages quoted could also be understood on the assumption that “the house of Judah” is our sect. This is indeed justified; though one ought perhaps to except DSH viii 1: “the doers of the Law in the house of Judah”, which shows, by implication, that the house of Judah also included such as did not observe the Law. The argument would be clinched in favour of identity of “Judah” and the sect if we accepted BARTHÉLÉMY’S ³⁾ and DUPONT-SOMMER’S proposal for filling up the lacuna in DSH ii 8: “... from the mouth of the priest whom God had placed in [the house of Juda]h, so as to interpret all the words of his servants, the prophets”. However, in spite of ELLIGER’S stylistic objections, the restitution of MARGALIOTH ⁴⁾ and I. RABINOWITZ: “... the priest in [whose heart wisdo]m had been given by God ...”, seems preferable on general grounds, even if the direct appointment of the Teacher of Righteousness by God is also stated by CDC i 11.

It is thus not to be decided for the time being whether “simplicity” is here to be taken in a laudatory sense or in a deprecatory one. In either case, the equation of “beasts” with the simple is obvious. As

¹⁾ The form of the next word is peculiar in M.T., and its meaning not clear in DSH. The following words of the lemma, here omitted, are explained later in the text of DSH.

²⁾ This does of course not preclude taking the word, with TEICHER, as name of the sect.

³⁾ *Revue Biblique* 59, 1952, p. 209.

⁴⁾ Quoted by HABERMANN, *‘Edah wə-‘Eduth*, ad loc.

for the equation of "Lebanon" with the council of the community, the reasons evade us.

The Targum translates "Lebanon" as His Sanctuary and "Beasts" as His People. "Lebanon" is a common sobriquet for the Temple; to the references enumerated by GINZBERG, *Legends of the Jews* VI, 395, add Targum Cant. iv 8. On the other hand, it is hardly natural to equate the Beasts with the people as a whole, nor does the People form a suitable opposite to the Temple. It seems that the Targum, having identified the Beasts with the people (i.e. a rather extended "house of Judah") by dint of tradition, replaced the identification of "Lebanon", which made no sense in the Targum's background, by another popular midrashic equation. But it seems reasonable to assume that the whole equation arose in sectarian circles, where it made sense. Interpretations of this kind, whatever their source, were apparently used by different circles and adapted by each to their needs, not always with full cognizance of the methods on which they were originally based.

V. SIMULTANEOUS INTERPRETATION OF TWO VARIANT READINGS

a) DSH iv 9 reads וישם for MT *wě-'āshēm* in Hab. i 11. In reading an imperfect, the Scroll agrees with all versions except the Targum. On the other hand, only the Vulgate (*corruet*)¹ has a form from *shmm*, all others presuppose *ye'sham*, which of course could easily become *yēsham*.

The commentary runs: Its interpretation is concerning the rulers of the Kittī'im, who by the council of [their?] ²) house of guilt (*ashmā-thām*) pass each man from before his fellow; their rulers come one after the other to ruin (*lashbīth*) the [].

We have here two complete interpretations, one to *wayya'avōr wayye'sham*, the second to *wayyā'avōr wayyāshēm*.

b) In DSH xi 9 והרעל is written for MT *wě-bē'ārēl* Hab. ii 16. The only ancient version which takes account of the MT reading is the Targum (*hīth'ar'al*, "bare thyself"). The others either translate "be agitated" (LXX, Pesh.) or "be plunged into torpor" (Aquila) i.e. *bērā'ēl*. I cannot account for the Vulgate's *conspire*.

¹) The Goettingen LXX states that Eth. has *diripiet*. This is due to a misreading: *yēmassēt* for the *yāmassēt* found both in LÖFGREN and the Asmara edn., which means *aufugiet*. This renders *exceleusetai*, found in some MSS by inner-Greek corruption for *exilasetai*.

²) SEGAL (*J.B.L.*, 70, 1951, 134) and ELLIGER supply "a".

The interpretation brings first a play on *hē'ārēl*: "for he had not circumcised the foreskin ('*orlath*) of his heart" (line 13), and then, out of its place, renders *hērā'ēl* in the phrase "the cup of the wrath of God shall stupefy him". The verb here is probably to be read in the Qal, *yivlē'ennū*, as the active form to the Niph'al in Is. xxviii 7, where the LXX fittingly translates it as *exestēsan* "they lost their senses". Note that the picture of the "cup of wrath", as well as the use of *bl'*¹) are taken from the preceding paragraph²).

VI. A TRANSPOSITION IN DSH

DSH vii 5-14, on Hab. ii 3:

- A כיא עוד חזון למועד יפיח³) לקץ ולוא יכוב
 B פשרו אשר יאריך הקץ האחרון יותר⁴) על כול אשר דברו
 הנביאים כיא רוי אל להפלה
 C אם יתמהמה חכה לו כיא בוא יבוא ולוא יאחר
 D פשרו על אנשי האמת עושי התורה אשר לוא ירפו ידיהם
 מעבודת האמת בהמשך עליהם הקץ האחרון
 E כיא כול קיצי אל יבואו לתכונם כאשר חקק [להם] ברוי ערמתו

The interpretations (B, D, E) seem in this passage to exhibit a curiously loose connection with the text (A, C). The usual point-for-point correspondence of the leading ideas is absent. The imperative in C is completely ignored in DE.

If we translate *yāfēah* in A, with A. V. and most interpreters of DSH, as "speaks" (a rendering not supported by any ancient version), we get the exact opposite of what the commentary says, for the prophets, who "speak of the end", surely "lied" in announcing it too soon. But we get a suitable sense from Mishnaic **נפשו את לפוח** "to dishearten him" (Num. Rabba xx), **נפש חסירה אל תפוח** "do not dishearten (Greek *mē lypēsēs*) a poor man" (Sir. iv 2), and the idiom **בפחי נפש** "in despair"⁵). It then closely corresponds to the Niph'al of

¹) B.D.B. knows only one root *bl'*. KOEHLER separates our meaning as *bl'* III ("related to *bll'*") from *bl'* II (Pu., "to be brought (news)"), which latter he rightly connects with Arabic *ballagha*. BEN-JEHUDAH also takes ours as a separate root, but omits KOEHLER's II (which he takes to mean "to be destroyed"). I would propose to combine KOEHLER's II and III as *bl'* II, since Arabic *balagha* also means "to affect" (with punishment, etc.) and *buligha* "to be exhausted".

²) Cf. par. III (c).

³) MT: *wē-yāfēah*.

⁴) Or read, with YALON, **ויתר**.

⁵) On which cf. SEGAL, *Lesbonenu* 9, 1938, 45-8.

māshakh in D, used with the sense of the Pu'al Pr. xiii 12, and with the pregnant addition of 'al "against, to the disadvantage of".

The verb (probably to be read *yafuah*) is thus taken in a plural meaning. DSH sometimes takes singular verbs of the text as plurals. In viii 11 on the contrary, plural verbs in viii 5 (against MT singulars) are interpreted as singulars. Hence also *lō yēkhaẓẓēv* may be taken as a plural, corresponding to "their hands shall not weaken" in D.

If D thus appears to be the interpretation of A, B turns out to fit C no less well, for "to last longer than announced" expresses admirably the idea of *yithmahmah*. It is easy to see what caused the transposition: it is more logical to speak of the duration of the epoch before describing people's reaction to its long duration. But in transposing, the copyist left E in position as explanation of *wē-lō yē'ahēr*.

Thus restored the paragraph reads (in the order ADCBE):

"For the vision is yet for an appointed time, he shall be in despair for the end *to come*, but he shall not disappoint". Its interpretation is concerning the men of truth ¹⁾, the doers of the Law, whose hands shall not weaken from the service of truth (or: true service ²⁾), though the last epoch is too long drawn out for them. "Though it tarry, wait for it, for it will surely come, and it will not be late". Its interpretation is that the last epoch shall be longer than all that the prophets have told, for the mysteries of God are for wonderment. Because all epochs of God come to their conclusion ³⁾, as God has established for them in the mysteries of His wisdom.

VII. CDC AND A SAYING OF JESUS

Mark xiv 41 reads in the A. V.:

"And he cometh the third time, and saith unto them: Sleep on now, and take your rest; it is enough, the hour is come; behold, the son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners."

The word here rendered "it is enough" (Vulgate: *sufficit*) is in the Greek *apechei*. No parallels have been found in Greek to its impersonal use here. In some traditions "the end" is added, producing the phrase "the end is far away", but no meaning for this phrase seems to have been suggested hitherto.

To resolve this famous crux, M. BLACK ⁴⁾, suggests that the phrase

¹⁾ Cf. "the lot of truth", CDC xiii 12.

²⁾ Probably = "prayer", cf. CDC xi 23 (DSL).

³⁾ Cf. *tēkhūnāthō* Job xxiii 3, which LXX and Saadia translate "end, conclusion". On the other hand, תכון in DSD ix 12 can hardly mean this; in the parallel passage CDC xii 21 it is replaced by *mishpāt*.

⁴⁾ *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, 2nd ed., 1954, p. 161.

(with "the end") is due to a misreading of the Aramaic original, which was, according to him "the end presses", with original דחיק being misread as רחיק "is far away". But apart from the fact that whoever translated thus can have paid little attention to the sense of what he was translating, the meaning attributed to the hypothetical Aramaic verb is almost as unusual as that of *apechei*. The proverbial saying which BLACK quotes (B.T. Berakhoth 64a) exhibits the daring construction often found in highly pointed antithetic sayings, and cannot be taken as evidence for common usage ¹).

With all due reserve I would like to point out that the eschatological phrase in Micah vii 11, which—whatever its real meaning—is rendered by A. V. as "in that day shall the decree be far removed", is quoted CDC iv 12 in the form "the decree has been far removed". The context makes it clear that this was one of the catchphrases which immediately suggested Messianic events.

What would be more natural than for Jesus to use such a phrase at the moment when the whole train of Messianic events was set in motion?

The phrase used in Mark, *apechei to telos*, translates *rāḥaq ba-ḥōq* quite correctly; it even has the article, as in CDC. *Ḥōq* means "end" in Job xiv 13, where LXX translates it as "time" (*chronos*) as it does with *qēṣ* Job vi 11.

LXX, it is true, translates in Micah *apotripsetai nomima*, and Symmachus, Theodotion, and Targum all render *ḥōq* as "decree". How this was understood, is shown by the Targum: "on that day the decrees of the gentiles shall be removed". Aquilas has *akrisia* "confusion, lawlessness": while playing on the principal sense of *ḥōq*, this rendering ingeniously suggests also Messianic events.

I would suggest that the addition "and the hour" in Western texts of Mark is a very old explanatory enlargement. "The Hour" (*ba-shā'āh*) is one of the most common rabbinic expressions for the end of the world.

The translator of Mark was evidently not aware of the scriptural origin of the phrase before him in Hebrew or Aramaic, and therefore did not assimilate it to LXX. It is of course not intended here to

¹) A possible justification of BLACK's suggestion might be found by taking *dēḥiq* as a passive participle: "the end is being hastened", cf. the common *dāḥaq eth ba-shā'āh* in the sense of "was impatient for the Messianic time to come" or "acted prematurely". It seems to me that such an idea of the Time being hastened against God's will hardly has a place in this context.

claim a literary connection between this saying and CDC, only a common intellectual climate, which led to the use of the same tags in similar situations ¹⁾).

¹⁾ The instance of a similarity between a saying of Jesus and CDC iv 20-21 which is claimed to exist by TEICHER in *J.J.S.* 5, 1954, p. 38, appears to me to bear the same explanation rather than the suggestion that CDC explicitly quotes Jesus' saying, without even saying so.

SOME NOTES ON לִץ AND ITS DERIVATIVES

BY

H. NEIL RICHARDSON

Syracuse, N. Y.

Introduction

In the Book of Proverbs the verb לִץ and its derivatives occur seventeen times. A perusal of the various translations and commentaries quickly indicates considerable lack of unanimity among scholars as to the sense of this word. Lexicons are not of much help either since they tend also towards diversity. The problem is intensified when one examines the passages outside of the Book of Proverbs in which this root and its various derived forms appear.

BROWN, DRIVER, and BRIGGS (= BDB)¹⁾ give the meaning of "scorn" to the verb לִץ in spite of the fact that the closest forms which they can find do not have this sense at all. M. A. CANNEY²⁾ points out the difficulty which one faces in translating לִץ in the Qal as "scorn" and in the Hiph'il as "interpret". He goes on to say, "I suggest that in Qal it means 'to talk freely' and in the Hiphil 'to talk freely' or 'to make (others) to talk freely'; and further that the noun לִצ, used so often in the Book of Proverbs, means, not 'a scorner', but a 'babbler'. 'Scorner' seems to be a pure guess."³⁾ P. A. H. DE BOER in 1943 offered the meaning "to repeat, in a different way" as the basic sense of לִץ. He suggested that מְלִיצ is one who repeats the words of another sometimes, as in Job xvi 20, in a mocking fashion. In Jok xxxiii 23 he concluded that מְלִיצ must be translated "intercessor"⁴⁾.

KOEHLER seems not to have been able to come to a final decision in this matter. For the verb he gives both "talk big" (= *grosspreche*-

¹⁾ BROWN, DRIVER, BRIGGS, *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*.

²⁾ *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, vol. 40, Jan. 1924, p. 135 ff. (KOEHLER in *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*, p. 481, refers to this article incorrectly, attributing it to ALBRIGHT, and cites the page as 35).

³⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 136.

⁴⁾ *Oudtestamentische Studiën*, III, p. 165f.

risch sein) in the Qal and "be the spokesman" or "interpreter" in the Hiph'il. For *lās* he gives "prattler" (= *Schwätzer* — (big) talker, prattler, babbler) and "scorner" (= *Spötter*)! To *lāsôn* is attached the meaning "boasting prattle" (= *grossstuerisches Geschwätz*); but for *m'lîṣāh* he gives the meaning "alluding saying". Thus one might say that KOEHLER has been influenced to some degree by CANNEY's observation; the question remains, however, whether one might go further in unifying the translations of *lîṣ* and its derivatives in the direction which CANNEY and KOEHLER have already taken. In view of the fact that there are no cognates which throw light on the meaning of this root, we must rely upon an examination of the passages in which the word appears.

The purpose of this paper is to examine the occurrences of *lîṣ* and its derivatives in an effort to show that as a matter of fact *lîṣ* and the substantives derived from it have the meaning of "talk freely" and other related senses.

לִּי?

Proverbs ix 12

w'laṣtā l'bbadd'kbā thiṣṣā and (if) you engage in loose talk you alone will bear (the consequences).

OESTERLEY ¹⁾, TOY ²⁾, GORDON ³⁾, BDB, and the Holy Scriptures according to the Massoretic Text (= HS) all give the sense of "scorn" to the verb here. The Revised Standard Version (= RSV) renders it "scoff". KOEHLER gives the meaning "talk big". FRANKENBERG ⁴⁾ and WILDEBOER ⁵⁾ both prefer *Spötter*. LXX translated the verb with *κακὸς ἀποβῆς*.

There is nothing in the verse itself or in the context which demands one rendering or another. However, "talk big, freely" or even "loosely" would fit as well as "scorn". However, LXX may throw some additional light upon the subject. In LXX there is a fairly long addition to this verse in the form of an explanation of the second line, both of the nature of *κακὸς* and of the consequences. Here one

¹⁾ OESTERLEY, W. O. E., *The Book of Proverbs*.

²⁾ TOY, C. H., *The Book of Proverbs*.

³⁾ GORDON, ALEX. R. in *The Complete Bible, An American Translation*, J. M. P. SMITH and EDGAR J. GOODSPEED, editors.

⁴⁾ FRANKENBERG, W., *Die Sprüche*.

⁵⁾ WILDEBOER, G., *Die Sprüche*.

finds ψεύδουσιν—lie, falsehood, untruth—which would appear to be the interpretation of the sense of the original *w^alaṣṭā*. This in turn would support the meaning “talk big” to a greater degree than “scorn”.

Psalm cxix 51

ṛēdhīm h·līsunî 'adh-m·ōdh Godless men utterly deride me
mittôrāth·kēhā lō' nāṭīthī but I do not turn away from thy law¹).

This translation of RSV is one of several variations. J. M. P. SMITH²⁾ rendered the first line as follows: "The arrogant have scoffed at me bitterly"; OESTERLEY³⁾: "The arrogant have me greatly in derision"; HS: "The proud have had me greatly in derision". The verb here is a Hiph'il for which KOEHLER gives the sense "be the spokesman" or "deride", citing this verse for the latter. BDB gives the sense "deride". However, the meaning "deride" would seem to be very much a guess since the change from Qal to Hiph'il stem has not actually resulted in any alteration of the sense of the root.

It is interesting to note, however, that the Peshitta has a different reading. Reconstructing the Hebrew on the basis of this Syriac version we have *'ill'sunî* for *h'hl'sunî* and *'adb-m'* *ôdb* has been omitted. This would yield in the first line of the verse the following translation: "The insolent pressed hard upon me"; followed then by the second line: "(But) I did not turn away from thy law."

In view of the fact that *h'el'sunî* is not without some difficulty and since the Peshitta gives a better sense it would seem as though its reading ought to be adopted.

Proverbs xix 28

ʿēdh belīyāʿal yālīs mišpāt A worthless witness mocks at justice
ʾāpbi rēšāʿim yēbhallaʿ-ʾāwen and the mouth of the wicked devours ini-
 quity⁴).

Our authorities are fairly evenly divided between “mock”—RSV, HS, OESTERLEY—and “scoff”—TOY and GORDON—as the translation for *yālîš* in the first line of this verse. FRANKENBERG prefers *spottet*. BDB agrees with TOY and GORDON while KOEHLER suggests “deride”. It is true in this instance that to give the sense “talk loosely”

¹) Translation of RSV.

2) *American Translation.*

3) *The Psalms.*

4) Translation of RSV.

to the verb *yālîš* raises the problem of the relationship of *mišpāṭ* to the verb. However, I think that it would not be straining the syntax too greatly to render the first line "The worthless witness babbles of justice."

When we turn to the second line of the verse we find some greater unity among scholars. OESTERLEY, TOY, KOEHLER, and G. BEER ¹⁾ all sense a difficulty in *yᵇbhallaʿ*. OESTERLEY sums it up by saying, "This (i.e. swalloweth) hardly gives sense." ²⁾ These all suggest the emendation *yabbîaʿ* for the verb as it stands, yielding the translation of the second line as follows: "And the mouth of the wicked bubbles forth evil." What a striking parallelism this reconstruction yields when the first line is translated as above, thus supporting, in a small way, the meaning "talk freely" for *lîš*.

Proverbs iii 34

ʿim-lallēšîm hāʿ-yālîš Though he scorns the scorners.

At the outset this is recognized as a difficult line as a perusal of commentaries will indicate. OESTERLEY ³⁾ and BEER ⁴⁾ prefer to read *ʿim-lēšîm*, translating, "with the scorners he will be scornful."

Since we have antithetical parallelism we would expect something like *zîdîm* to contrast with *ʿnayîm* in the second line. This apparently is what LXX had, since we find that the Greek reads as follows: *κύριος ὑπερηφάνους ἀντιτάσσεται*—the Lord resists the proud—which the author of 1 Peter read as indicated in v 5. Probably then the solution to the problem of *lîš* in this instance lies somewhere in the direction of recognizing that the present text is corrupt and that in the absence of a better solution we ought to follow LXX.

Hosea vii 5

hēhēllūʿ ⁵⁾ *sārîm hʾmath mîyāyin* Princes were sick (from) the heat of wine;
māšak yādbô ʿeth-lōšēšîm he stretched forth his hand with babblers.

W. R. HARPER, translating *lōšēšîm* as "loose fellows", has some difficulty with the verse: "very difficult, perhaps impossible, to understand." ⁶⁾ This would seem to stem from an inadequate under-

¹⁾ In KITTEL, *Biblia Hebraica*.

²⁾ OESTERLEY, *The Book of Proverbs*.

³⁾ P. 28.

⁴⁾ KITTEL, *Biblia Hebraica*.

⁵⁾ Read thus with ancient versions.

⁶⁾ *Amos and Hosea*, p. 296.

standing of the meaning of *lîṣ* which appears here as a Pol'el participle.

Here, as in Prov. xx 1 and Is. xxviii 14, this root is used to describe drunkards. As we shall note in our discussion of those two passages and especially in connection with Is. xxviii 14, "babbler" is a far more appropriate translation than "scorner" when it applies to men who have overindulged in alcoholic beverages.

Isaiah xxviii 22

w'e'attā 'al-titblōṣāṣū And now do not babble.

In an extensive discussion below we shall show that *'anšē lāṣôn* in Is. xxviii 14 must be translated "babbling fellows." It would seem that verse 22 refers back to the babblers and that this Hithpol'el form ought to have that sense in this verse.

מְלִיץ

Genesis xlii 23

w'e'hēn lō' yādb'e'ū kī ṣōmēa' yōsēph kī hammēlîṣ bēnōthām And they did not know that Joseph heard them because the intermediary was between them.

It is with this passage that CANNEY¹⁾ was mainly concerned in his discussion of *lîṣ* and certain related words. As he points out, translators since the time of LXX have preferred "interpreter" for *mēlîṣ* in this passage. At first glance it does seem to be a natural interpretation of the verse but there is nothing which requires it.

As SKINNER implies in his statement, "This is the only place in the patriarchal history where diversity of language appears as a bar to intercourse"²⁾, it is quite extraordinary to come upon an interpreter in this passage. Furthermore, it is here only that LXX had occasion to use either ἐρμηνεύς or ἐρμηνευτής!

CANNEY states, "There is no reason to think that it (i.e. *mēlîṣ*) means an interpreter in the strict sense of the word."³⁾ He goes on to point out that *mēlîṣ* "here denotes some official intermediary or go-between"⁴⁾. In this position the present writer concurs.

¹⁾ *AJSL*, p. 135 ff.

²⁾ *ICC*, p. 477.

³⁾ *AJSL*, p. 137.

⁴⁾ *Ibid.*

Isaiah xliii 27

ʾābhīkḥā ḥārīʾ sōn ḥāṭāʾ Your first father sinned
 ʾm·līšēkḥā pās·ʾū bhī and your spokesmen transgressed against me.

As MARTI¹⁾ suggests, *m·līšēkḥā* refers to the prophets. In one sense the prophets were mediators (MARTI's *Mittler*) but basically they were speakers. They did not claim to be interpreters of the word of God. On the contrary, they were called to utter the word itself.

Again it might be well to note that the Syriac seems to follow a text which had *šallīrékḥā* instead of *m·līšēkḥā*. Ruler might seem to be a better parallel to father than either mediator or spokesman, but the earliest textual evidence—1QIs^a—supports MT.

2 Chronicles xxxii 31

w·kḥēn bimlīšē sārē bābbel So in the matter of the envoys of the princes
 ham·šall·hīm ʿālāyw ... of Babylon who had been sent to him ...

Here the translators and commentators agree upon "envoy" or "ambassador" for *mēlīš* as the context clearly implies. Curiously, however, BARNES²⁾ states: "Lit. 'interpreters' ", no doubt depending more heavily upon his lexicon than upon the plain meaning of the passage. LXX with πρεσβευταῖς understood the term as meaning "ambassador" rather than "interpreter" in which case they would have used ἐρμηνεύς.

The parallel passages in 2 Kings xx and Is. xxxix do not help greatly, since we find *s·phārīm* in place of *mēlīšīm*. Many commentators—MARTI, DUHM, CHEYNE, and others—have suggested substituting *sārīšīm* for *s·phārīm*. In Is. xxxix 1 one might also suggest *sōph·rīm*. However, these have no support either in ancient versions or in 1QIs^a; in the latter case we would have to have סופרים to support the conjectured emendation. However LXX added καὶ πρέσβεις in Is. xxxix 1 since this is the sense of the passage.

At any rate, letters and gifts are most logically carried by envoys of some importance and the next verse in both 2 Kings xx and Is. xxxix states that they were shown Hezekiah's treasures. The situation thus does not call for interpreters but envoys whose powers of persuasion may be great enough to guarantee the friendship of the Judean ruler. In this regard then *mēlīš* in 2 Chronicles has just the

¹⁾ MARTI, K., *Das Buch Jesaja*, p. 299.

²⁾ *Cambridge Bible*, p. 274.

precise meaning called for in this historically and diplomatically significant situation.

Job xvi 20

mēlîṣay rē'āy My friends scorn me.

This translation of RSV deals with the Hebrew about as satisfactorily as possible. But MT is patently in error at this point. This was clearly not the text which LXX translated. Furthermore the entire verse as it now stands seems to be intrusive. Verse 21 would seem to refer back to 'ēdbî in verse 19. Between the two we would expect some basis for the statement of verse 21.

Some of the difficulty of the verse may be solved by the conjecture of BEER ¹⁾ and DUHM to read *yimmāṣē' lî rē'î*. But to whatever solution we may wish to come we probably will have to recognize that *mēlîṣ* (or some form of it) was not originally used and that this order of consonants is accidental.

Job xxxiii 23

im-yēš 'ālāyw mal'āk mēlîṣ 'ēpādh If there be for him an angel, a mediator,
ninnî-'āleph l'baggādh l'ādham yāš'rô one of the thousand, to declare to
 man what is right for him;

This translation of RSV is close to that of J. M. P. SMITH in *The American Translation*. HS prefers "intercessor", while DRIVER and GRAY ²⁾ translate *mēlîṣ* with "an interpreter". LXX seems not to have had the present Hebrew text.

Certainly the passage in which this verse appears does not require "interpreter". The angel comes to make some matter known to man by word of mouth. Hence the angel is characterized as *mēlîṣ*, i.e. a speaker of considerable fluency, but not an interpreter in the strict sense of the term. The angel does not come either to interpret from one language to another or to explain the significance of life's experiences. His sole function is to inform man of his rights and that a way has been found for him to be restored. Thus the sense of "talk freely" would seem to be confirmed for this verse.

¹⁾ *Biblia Hebraica*.

²⁾ *Job*, ICC, Vol. I, p. 290.

לז

Proverbs xix 29a

nākbônû lallēšîm š'phāṭîm Judgments are established for babblers.

Following immediately upon verse 28 above we hardly can escape the meaning of "babbler" for *lēš* here. It should be noted that TOY, OESTERLEY, and BEER all prefer LXX which has μάστιγες —rod, whip—for *š'phāṭîm*. Thus we probably should read "Whips are established for babblers".

Fools—*k'sîlîm*—of the second line of the verse is then in parallelism with "babblers" rather than with "scoffers" or "mockers." Although we do not have a clear-cut picture of the meaning of *k'sîl* it would seem that "stupid, dull" satisfies the uses of this word very well. This in turn is a much more satisfactory characterization of a babbler than of a scorner. On the contrary, a scorner is apt to be quite the opposite of a dullard; he is very often a brilliant fellow and it is out of his learning that his contempt for simple things such as believing in the law of God comes. Thus it would seem that the parallelism here supports the sense of "babbler" rather than "scorner" for *lēš*.

Proverbs xiv 6

biqqeš-lēš hokhmā wā'āyin A babbler sought wisdom but in vain,
w'dba'ath l'nābhôn nāqāl But knowledge for a discerning person is an easy matter.

Here again the translators and commentators prefer "scoffer" or "scorner" for *lēš*. However, on the basis of the verse itself, as well as the context, "babbler" would seem preferable.

As we have just pointed out in our comment on Prov. xix 29a, a scoffer or scorner is not necessarily a dull fellow devoid of knowledge. At any rate, this is more characteristic of the babbler than of the scorner for frequently the latter is an intelligent man. Furthermore, the verse being in antithetical parallelism, *nābhôn* is to be understood as opposite to *lēš*. Now actually a scoffer or scorner is frequently not lacking in discernment. On the contrary he is usually quite able to distinguish between two different points of view, one of which he scorns or scoffs. Or else how would he know when to scoff? On the other hand, a babbler, a loose talker, is such precisely because he is lacking in discernment.

Finally, in the preceding verse we have a reference to a lying wit-

ness. (Cf. Prov. xix 28 above) Again it would seem that this is a closer synonym for a babbler than for a scorner.

Proverbs xiii 1, xv 12

bēn ḥākhām mūsar 'ābh A wise son (accepts) the chastening of his father.
w'lēš lō'-šāma' g'ārā But a babbler does not hear a rebuke.
lō' ye'habh-lēš hōkhēaḥ lō' A babbler does not like rebuke directed against himself;
'el-ḥākhāmīm lō' yēlēk Unto wise men he will not go.

In neither of these two verses is there any evidence which could decisively clinch the argument for or against "babblers" as the translation for *lēš*. If Prov. xiii 1-3 were taken together, verse 3 might give some weight to the argument favoring "babblers." (Cf. above on Prov. xxi 23, 24).

Isaiah xxix 20

ke'-'āphēs 'ārīš w'kehālā lēš For a ruthless one shall come to nought and a babbler cease.

RSV and GORDON¹⁾ prefer "scoffer" while SKINNER²⁾ and HS prefer "scorner." That *lēš* is parallel to *'ārīš* is not much help since the meaning of *'ārīš* is not as certain as it might be. Whatever its meaning, however, it is not an exact synonym for *lēš* whichever of the translations noted above we wish to choose for the latter.

When we move on to the next verse, however, we find some help in our problem. Here we discover that a man is made out to be an offender by a word. We are quite aware of the damage which can be done to a man's reputation by loose or careless talk. The babbler can make the most upright person appear to be a traitor or a sinner in a very short time. In the last line of verse 21 we find that it is "an empty plea" that turns the trick. "An empty plea" and "a word [that] makes a man out to be an offender" are better characterizations of *lēš* if it means "babblers" than if it means "scorner".

Proverbs xix 25

lēš takeh 'āphethā ya'rīm Punish a babblers and the simple one will become shrewd.

Lēš here receives "scoffer", "scorner", and "mockers" as possible

¹⁾ *The American Translation.*

²⁾ *Cambridge Bible*, p. 223.

translations. However, there is nothing which requires any one of these. In contrast to TOY ¹⁾ we take *pethî* to be a reference to *lēš*. However, since *pethî* lacks the article it might well be understood as referring to someone other than the *lēš*. If, however, our interpretation is admitted, then it would seem that "babbler" is a better translation than "scorner" in accordance with our interpretation of Prov. xix 28, 29a and xiv 6 above.

Proverbs xxi 11

ba'ānāš-lēš yehkam-pethî In punishing a babbler, a simpleton becomes wise.

As in Prov. xix 25 above, the question is whether or not *lēš* and *pethî* refer to the same person. Here the syntax makes that more probable than in xix 25 ²⁾. It needs simply then to be reiterated that "babbler" seems to this writer to be a more satisfactory synonym for simpleton than does either "scoffer" or "scorner".

Proverbs i 22

'adb-māthay pethāyim t'ēbbhū pethî How long, oh simpletons, will you
love being simple;
w'lēšim lāšōn hām'dhū lāhem And babblers desire their own bab-
bling
ākēsilim yisn'ū-dbā'ath And fools hate knowledge?

Here also there is a preference among our authorities for "scoffers" and "scorners". Yet there is nothing in the verse which demands this translation. On the other hand, if our contention that "babbler" rather than "scorner" or "scoffer" is a better synonym for fool—*k'sil*—or simpleton—*pethî*—then the problem is solved in favor of "babbler".

Proverbs ix 7, 8

yōsēr lēš lōqēah lō qālōn He who admonishes a babbler gets dishonor
for himself
āmōkēhah l'rāšā' mūmō And he that reproves a wicked man his fault.
'al-tōkēhah lēš pen-yisnā'ekā Do not reprove a babbler lest he hate you;
bōkēhah l'pākēhām w'ye'hābhēkā Reprove a wise man and he will love you.

Our sources are fairly evenly divided between "scoffer"—GORDON,

¹⁾ P. 380.

²⁾ This position is in contrast to both OESTERLEY and TOY on this verse.

Toy, and RSV—and “scorner”—OESTERLEY, HS, and BDB. KOEHLER gives “prattler” and “scorner” as meanings for *lēš* in all occurrences without indicating either one for any particular passage. FRANKENBERG, WILDEBOER, and SCHLACHTER prefer *Spötter*.

Verse 8 gives us only a little help in determining the meaning of the word under discussion. It is in antithetical parallelism with *hākām*, a word which, if anything, is more general than *lēš* and hence not of great value in determining the meaning of our term. However, *hkm* seems basically to mean “be skillful”. Since a scorner or mocker may not be lacking in skill, “babbler” would be a better antonym for *hākām*.

In addition, the proper exegesis of verse 7 may give us some help. With the exception of this verse and Job xi 15 and xxxi 7 *mūm* refers to a physical defect ¹⁾. However in late Hebrew it seems not to be limited to this meaning. The sense of the verse seems to be that if one reproves a wicked man he will be charged with the sin of the wicked man ²⁾. OESTERLEY goes on to state that “there is an objection to this rendering because one expects in conformity with the general usage, a word corresponding to ‘shame’ in the first clause” ³⁾.

If we understand the meaning of *lēš* to be “babbler” then it is easy to see how one who reproaches others may soon be charged himself with the sin which he is reproaching. If in turn the gaining of the reputation of being a babbler is the nature of the *mūm* then this is indeed a “shame” (our “dishonor”) and OESTERLEY’s objection is disposed of ⁴⁾.

Proverbs xiv 9

אָוֹלִים יִלִּץ אָשָׁם The guilt-offering (or guilt) mocks fools.

ʾābhên yōšārîm rāšôn But among the upright there is goodwill ⁵⁾.

In this case, since the Hebrew is obscure ⁶⁾, I have chosen to begin with Toy’s “natural rendering”. As one might suspect the translations of this verse vary greatly. Limiting ourselves for the moment to the first line we find that RSV reads “God scorns the wicked”;

¹⁾ KOEHLER, p. 489; OESTERLEY, p. 69.

²⁾ OESTERLEY, *ibid.*

³⁾ *Ibid.*

⁴⁾ At any rate it would be as satisfactory a parallel as the suggested emendation *ʾēlîmmāb* in KITTEL, *Biblia Hebraica*.

⁵⁾ Toy, p. 286.

⁶⁾ So RSV note j on this verse.

OESTERLEY: "The foolish make a mock at guilt"; HS: "Amends pleadeth for fools". GORDON, as he often does when MT is difficult, gets his clue from LXX and translates, "Guilt has its home among fools".

LXX reads Οἰκίαι παρανόμων ὀφειλῆσουσιν καθαρισμόν, οἰκίαι δὲ δικαίων δεκταί —The houses of transgressors will need (owe) purification, but the houses of the just are acceptable. Retaining as much of the present Masoretic text as possible that would suppose that the original Hebrew read as follows: אָהֳלֵי לִצִּים אָשָׁם וּבֵית יִשְׂרָאֵל כָּצוֹן

The changes which occurred here are really very simple scribal errors if one will keep the Qumran Scrolls carefully in mind ¹).

With this reconstruction before us the verse might be translated as follows:

The tents of babblers are an offence,
But the house of the upright is a pleasure.

Again it must be admitted that neither the verse itself nor the context demand the translation of *lēš* as "babbler". On the other hand, "babbler" yields as good sense as does "scorner" or "mockers".

Proverbs xxi 24

zēdh yāhīr lēš š'mō A presumptuous, haughty (man)—"babbler" is his name—
‘ōšeh b'ebhrath zādhōn Acts with insolent anger.

Again our authorities prefer "scorner" or "scoffer". There is nothing in the verse itself which requires either of these meanings. As TOY ²) points out, the verse seems to be an interpretation of *lēš*. But as to the proper English translation no clue is here given.

If we look to the preceding verse, however, we do find there a possible answer to our problem. In verse 23 we read: "The one who

¹) In a first century text the Hebrew of the first line would have appeared as follows: אָהֳלֵי לִצִּים אָשָׁם. In transcribing the first two words the scribe committed four errors: 1) He made the first right hand stroke of the *he* but then did not finish the letter. An examination of 1Qp Hab and 1QS will reveal that at times *waw* and the right hand stroke of *he* differ very little. 2) He transferred the *mem* from the second word to the first word since it follows *yodh*. 3) Confused by the repetition of *lamedh-yodh*, he wrote a *yodh* before the second *lamedh*-ditto-graphy. 4) Finally, since it was no longer necessary, due to the fact that he unconsciously knew that he had already written the *mem*, he omitted the *yodh* after *sadhe*.

²) P. 408.

guards his mouth and his tongue guards himself from troubles." The two verses should be taken together. The first of the two indicates that he who is not a babbler saves himself a lot of difficulty. The second verse sets forth the nature of the babbler, and how he acts.

Proverbs xxii 10

gārēš lēš wəyēšē' mādhôn Drive out a babbler and strife will go out.
wəyišbōth dīn wəqālôn And a legal case and dishonor will cease.

Here "scoffer" or "scorner" is the choice of our authorities. But there is nothing in the verse which demands that meaning for *lēš*. Contrary to Toy¹⁾ who states that "the reference is probably not specially to proceedings in courts of law", we hold that *dīn* strongly implies that a court situation lies behind this saying. LXX with συνέδριον added in the first clause and in the gloss would tend to support this interpretation. The next verse with its reference to the king who approves of speech that is marked by its qualities of agreeableness—*hēn*—also suggests a situation in which legal decisions must be made. At least the evidence points to an official assembly of some sort and *dīn* certainly suggests a court scene.

As in Prov. xix 28, the question arises as to whether the sense of 'babblers' or "one who engages in loose talk" is more suitable in reference to a court situation than "scorner" or "scoffer". Loose talk is more apt to result in a false law suit than the words of a scorner. *Lēš* here would seem to refer to one whose talk has resulted in false charges. When he is dismissed from the courtroom all trouble vanishes.

Proverbs xxiv 9

zimmāth 'wīl²⁾ haṭṭā'th The loose conduct of a fool is sin.
wəthō'əbbāth l'ādhām lēš And a babbler is an abomination to man.

Here also our authorities prefer "scoffer" or "scorner" for *lēš*. One interesting observation on this verse is that both *zimmā* and *tō'əbbā* have overtones of sexual immorality in most of their occurrences. Whether this fact has any significance for our verse is difficult to ascertain.

On the other hand, KOEHLER's meaning of "loose conduct" for *zimmā* is a striking parallel to our suggestion of "one who engages

¹⁾ P. 417.

²⁾ Read so with the versions.

in loose talk" or "babbler" in this verse. Of greater value even is *ba'al-m'zimmôth* of the previous verse. Literally this probably means "owner of intrigues". Four of our authorities—OESTERLEY, RSV, HS, Toy—interpret it as having to do with mischief. Toy¹⁾ rightly links these two verses together and hence this phrase for mischief-maker must be related to our *lēš*. This relationship is best seen in "mischief-maker" is a characterization of a babbler. Psalm lii 1, 2 (= Heb. 3, 4) speaks of the mischief²⁾ (*rā'd*) done by the tongue. On Proverbs xxiv 8 OESTERLEY³⁾ states "'mischievous person', lit. 'owner of mischiefs', would thus seem to be a well-known term applied to a certain type of man, cf. our 'chatterbox'" (Italics mine). In this context then it would seem that *lēš* is best understood as one who is a "prattler" or "babbler" rather than "scorner" or "scoffer".⁴⁾

Psalm i 1

lābh-môšabbh lēšim lō' yāšabbh And does not sit in the seat of an evil person

In this verse as in Prov. xiii 1 and xv 12 there is nothing to determine absolutely the meaning of *lēšim*. It stands in parallelism with *rōšā'im* and *ḥaṭṭā'im*. The extreme force of these two words would, however, seem to require something stronger than that which is implied by "babbler." In post-biblical Hebrew *lēš* came to mean "be reckless" and in the Hiph'il "lead astray". These are obviously later semantic developments of our basic meaning "talk loosely" for *lēš* and perhaps had already begun when this probably very late psalm was written. Also as we have seen, *lēš* was used with some variety of synonyms and might well have come to mean generally an evil person without the specific connotation of scoffer.

Proverbs xx 1

lēš hayyayim hōmeh šekhār Wine is a babbler, strong drink is uproarious

All of our authorities prefer "mockery" here. But the verse seems strongly to militate against this translation. "The drink is credited with the characteristics which it produces in men"⁵⁾. Those charac-

¹⁾ P. 444.

²⁾ RSV.

³⁾ P. 209 f.

⁴⁾ It is an interesting coincidence that one English dictionary (*The American College Dictionary*, edited by C. L. BARNHART) gives as a meaning for mischief-maker, "one who stirs up discord, as by tale-bearing"!

⁵⁾ Toy, p. 383.

teristics are *lēš* and *hōmeh*. In the case of the latter the basic meaning is "make noise, be tumultuous" ¹⁾. Most of our authorities prefer "brawler" but this implies a quarrel which *hmb* does not. The closer English synonym to the sense of *hmb* as between babbler and mocker is quite plainly "babblers."

Furthermore, the characteristic result of an intemperate use of alcoholic beverages is not that one becomes a mocker but rather that one indulges in idle, foolish, or irrational talk—one babbles in the narrower, stricter sense of the word. In this verse one can hardly escape the sense of "babblers" for *lēš*. The importance of this verse in determining the meaning of the word is noted by TOY who states: "the simple sense (i. e. of *lēš*) occurs in 20¹" ²⁾. (Cf. also below on Is. xxviii 14).

לִיץ

Isaiah xxviii 14

lākēn šim'ū db'bhār-YHWH 'anšē lāšōn Therefore hear the word of Yahwe, you babbling fellows.

RSV, HS, GORDON ³⁾, all prefer "scoff" for *lāšōn*; SKINNER ⁴⁾ and BDB prefer "scorn". KOEHLER gives "boasting prattle" (= *gross-tuerisches Geschwätz*). However, a proper exegesis of the entire context would seem to indicate that "babblers" is the proper translation.

Chapter xxviii opens with a reference to drunkards. Verses 7 and 8 give us as graphic and potent a picture of drunken debauchery as may be found in scripture. As the prophet attempts to preach to these drunkards they throw back at him the famous words of verse 10: *kē šaw lāšāw šaw lāšāw qaw lāqāw qaw lāqāw* זֶ'עֵר שָׁמ זֶ'עֵר שָׁמ. The prophet answers that Yahwe will reply by means of a strange, alien language, strongly suggesting that the words which have just been uttered are themselves not understandable. Thus the word of Yahwe will not be understandable to them and he repeats their drunken utterance, *šaw lāšāw*, etc.

It is then that we come to the verse in question. The prophet continues to address these drunkards ⁵⁾ identifying them as the

¹⁾ KOEHLER; cf. also BDB.

²⁾ TOY, p. 23.

³⁾ *American Translation*.

⁴⁾ *The Book of Isaiah (Cambridge Bible)*.

⁵⁾ Contrary to K. MARTI, *Das Buch Jesaja*, on this passage, *lākēn* (verse 14) would tend to relate this verse and what follows to that which precedes.

rulers of the people and as *ʿanšê lāšôn*. The rulers of the people are not necessarily limited to the political leaders but may also refer to the religious leaders of verse 7. From the entire context it would seem far more preferable to refer to them as drunken babblers than scoffers or scorers. Their condition of extreme inebriation hardly makes it possible for them to do more than give utterance to irrational, incoherent sounds (cf. also above on Proverbs xx 1).

Proverbs xxix 8

ʿanšê lāšôn yāphîbû qiryá Babblers kindle discord in a town
waḥḥāmîm yāšîbbû ʿāph But wise men turn wrath away.

Again our authorities seem to prefer “scorners” or “scoffers”; TOY—unscrupulous, GORDON—unprincipled. There is nothing in the verse which demands one translation or another. Suffice it to say that babblers can cause as much trouble in a town as scorers or scoffers.

מליצה

Proverbs i 6, Habakkuk ii 6

The noun *mēlîṣā* would seem to this writer to involve us in an entirely different problem resulting in an entirely different solution. Its occurrence in Prov. i 6 strongly supports the meaning “alluding saying” which KOEHLER gives it; BDB suggests “figure, enigma.” This meaning might also be given it in Hab. ii 6 although most translators prefer to treat it as an adjective, e. g. RSV’s “scoffing derision.” Reconstructing the verse following PROCKSCH¹⁾ we probably should read Hab. ii 6 somewhat as follows: “Shall not all of these take up a proverb and an alluding saying and ²⁾ a riddle against him . . .” We thus have a triplet of three synonymous terms.

Obviously it would be difficult to connect *mēlîṣā*, with this meaning, to *lîṣ* with the sense “talk big, freely” or “babble”. On the other hand, it seems entirely probable to this writer that the noun in question should be seen to have been derived from *mālaṣ* after the analogy of *qārîḏā*, *bēlîkḥā*, *bārîḏā*, *yēšîbbā*, and others. Although not occurring often *mālaṣ* clearly has the meaning “slip”. We thus would understand *mēlîṣā* to be “an alluding saying, i. e. one that slips away” or in a sense “a slippery saying”³⁾.

¹⁾ KITTEL, *Biblia Hebraica*.

²⁾ Following the Syriac.

³⁾ 1Qp Hab. viii 6 reads **ומליצי חידות** which we would translate “and (be) babblers of riddles”. Cf. BROWNLEE, W. in *The Biblical Archaeologist* XIV, 3, p. 67.

Conclusion

In brief conclusion we would make two observations. In nine instances the ancient versions, Peshitta and LXX, had either a different Hebrew text or found the root *liṣ* and its derivatives so difficult to translate that they changed the sense or added explanatory material.

Secondly, excepting the passages in which the ancient versions differ, we find that in some cases no particular translation is required by the context while in the remainder the verb "talk freely or big" and the noun "babbler" seem to satisfy the sense of the context best. Consequently we would urge these meanings for *liṣ* and its derivatives wherever they occur in MT and where that text is supported by LXX and Peshitta.

SINGULARITIES IN CONSECUTIVE-TENSE CONSTRUCTIONS IN THE ISAIAH SCROLL

BY

ARIE RUBINSTEIN

Manchester

Among DSIa variants somewhat summarily treated as mere copyists' errors or "simplifications" are the additional *waw* prefixed in a considerable number of instances to verbs and the sporadic variation of tenses. The present study is concerned with a number of irregularities in the use of the consecutive tenses in DSIa which result from these two tendencies. These irregularities have their analogies in various books of the MT, but not in the parallel passages of Isaiah. The purpose of the present study is to adduce, albeit very tentatively, a number of considerations, based on the singularities in the use of the consecutive tenses in DSIa, which may be relevant to the solution of linguistic and textual problems in the OT. The syntactical phenomena touched upon hardly justify conclusions as to their age. That some of them have affinity with so-called Mishnaic Hebrew is tolerably certain but, in view of the fact that little is known of the earlier stages of development of that idiom, it would be hazardous to speculate beyond this point ¹).

§ 1. *The co-ordination of verbal clauses by waw-conjunctive.*

The profuse use of the *waw*-conjunctive is a characteristic of DSIa. In itself it is probably one aspect of a general tendency towards a more prosaic style, perhaps in many cases hardly a conscious tendency ²). When, however, two or more verbal clauses which are asyndetic in the MT become thus united by the *waw*-conjunctive, constructions result which may combine either synonyms or verbs which would normally require a consecutive construction because the relation

¹) But cf. R. GORDIS, "Studies in the Relationship of Biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew" in the *Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume* (English Section), New York, 1945, pp. 173-175. See also M. H. SEGAL, *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*, Oxford, 1927, pp. 10-15.

²) Cf. Millar BURROWS, *JBL*, vol. 68 (1949), p. 209.

between them is one of dependency. In the latter case anomalous constructions might arise quite undesignedly. Bearing this in mind it may be possible, by restoring the asyndeton, to recover the original constructions in some instances in which an irregular construction has hitherto been attributed to the influence of Aramaic or late-Hebrew or has been consigned to the residue of inexplicable constructions. In other words: in these cases it need not necessarily be assumed that the *tense of the verb* is due to Aramaic or late-Hebrew influence or that the construction is inexplicable, rather must the verb construction first be tested by eliminating the *waw*-conjunctive. Thus, in Is. ix 7 נפל בישראל (>ו) would at once assume a normal form. In xlv 24 the DSIa reading עדיי יבואו (>ו) יבושו thus regularises the anomalous reading in the MT. A similar case is the DSIa reading אתן in xliii 4 for the unusual ואתן in the MT, into which L. KÖHLER, for example, was constrained to read the meaning 'ich werde geben und werde geben'¹).

We may illustrate our point by examples from DSIa. In the following the additional *waw* in the DSIa readings yields a combination of synonymous actions or states: vii 16-17 ... תעזב (+ו) יביא; xv 3 ... ירד (+ו) ... והליל; xxviii 29 ... הגדיל (+ו) ... הפליא; xxxiv 2 ... נתנם (+ו) החרים; xl 31 ... יעלו (+ו) יחליפו; lii 13 ירום (+ו) ... ישא and lvii 13 ... יקה (+ו) יקח. On the other hand, in the following the additional *waw* appears to lead to *irregular* constructions: iii 7 ... ישא (+ו), where either ישא or ונשא would be correct. In xxxiii 9 ... היה (+ו) is anomalous and falsely suggests a future state. Equally anomalous is the construction קצפתי על עמי (+ו) חללתי נחלתי ואתנם (MT) in DSIa xlvii 6, whether the *waw* prefixed to the last verb is taken as consecutive or conjunctive.

§ 2. *The perfect with waw-conjunctive for the imperfect with waw-consecutive.*

The perfect with *waw*-conjunctive occurs in a very small number of instances in DSIa for the normal MT usage to employ the imperfect with *waw*-consecutive. Thus, in xxxvi 21 is found the anomalous ... והחרישו ולוא ענו, which is identical, except for the place of the subject, with the construction in 2 Ki. xviii 36—a construction characterised by STADE as 'barbarous'²). Similarly DSIa has in lxvi 2

¹) *Deuteriojesaja*, Giessen, 1923, p. 75.

²) *ZAW*, vol. 6 (1886), p. 183.

.... ידי עשתה והיו כול אלה (ויהי for MT יהי), yielding the unusual היה where the MT has, consistently with the sense of the passage, יהי. This irregular introductory perfect with *waw*-conjunctive has its parallels in 1 Sa. i 12; x 9; xvii 48; xxv 20 and 2 Sa. vi 16¹).

§ 3. *The imperfect with waw-conjunctive for the perfect with waw-consecutive.*

The use of the imperfect with *waw*-conjunctive for the perfect with *waw*-consecutive in the MT, is a notable tendency in DSIa, but it is singular that this usage occurs only in the third person of the verb²). The following are examples of this tendency: iv 5 ויברא for וברא; x 26 ויעיר (hiph'el) for ועורר (polel); xi 8 וישעשע for ושעשע; xvii 13 ויגער for וגער; xx 5 ויבושו for ובשו; lvi 4 ויבחרו for ובחרו and lxii 9 ויהללו for והללו. In xxix 11, 12; lvii 14 and lxx 8 DSIa reads ויאמר for MT ואמר, which are almost certainly imperfects with *waw*-conjunctive.

The same phenomenon is to be observed in the use of the verb היה. Here, however, we note also examples of bare imperfects where MT has the perfect with *waw*-consecutive. These bare imperfects reflect apparently a secondary tendency in DSIa, viz. the consecutive construction having been abandoned, the *waw*-conjunctive becomes redundant and is dispensed with, without affecting the sense of the passage. Accordingly we find the following examples of the unusual use of the verb היה in DSIa: iii 24 ויהי for והיה; iv 3 ויהיה for והיה; v 5 ויהיה for והיה (twice); xvi 12 ויהיה for והיה; xxx 23 ויהיה for והיה; xxxiii 6 ויהיה for והיה; xxxiii 12 ויהי for והי; xxxv 8 ויהיה for והיה; xxxix 7 ויהי for והי and lvi 12 ויהי for והיה³). With the exception of iv 3 and xvi 12 where the verb serves to introduce a subsequent statement, the verb היה is used in the above examples as a predicate, lvi 12 being the only instance in which the jussive is appropriate.

Now the constructions resulting from the peculiar union of the imperfect with *waw*-conjunctive in DSIa have their parallels in the MT. For example, Is. xix 20 reads ... וישלח ... כי יצקו where DSIa has the normal form ושלח. DSI lvi 4 — ויבחרו ... אשר ישמרו

¹) וקרא in DSIa ix 5 could be a perfect-consecutive—see § 5b of the present study.

²) ואעצרה in DSIa lxvi 9 constitutes a separate problem. Cf. Gen. xiii 9 and 2 Sa. xii 8.

³) ויהי in DSIa xxix 15 for MT והיה could be a imperfect-consecutive.

is analogous to Ez. xiv 7 (... וַיַּעַל ... וַיָּנֹזר ... אשר יגור). In the following examples the tendency goes much further than in DSIa and affects a series of verbs. Thus in 2 Ch. xx 9 is found וַתִּשְׁמַע וַתֹּשִׁיעַ ... וַנִּזְעַק ... וַנַּעֲמֶדָה¹). Similarly in Da. xi 15 is found the construction (וַיִּשְׁפַּךְ ... וַיָּבֵא מֶלֶךְ הַצָּפוֹן (וַיִּשְׁפַּךְ ... וַיַּעֲמֵד ... וַיַּעֲשֶׂה הָבָא).

It is important to note in Da. xi 16-18 that the shortened imperfect is used in a non-jussive sense. How and where this usage came into being is still an unsolved problem²). It would appear, however, that it is the usage employed in the form וַיַּעַל in Ez. xiv 7, as well as in the form וַיְהִי in 1 Sa. x 5; 2 Sa. v 24 (1 Ch. xiv 15); Ru. iii 4 and 1 Ki. xiv 5 b where one might have expected וַהֲיָה. In the case of the Ezekiel instance DRIVER suggests that the last two verbs may be translated 'who separates himself *that he should* cherish' and remarks that the infinitive with lamedh might be substituted for וַיַּעַל without appreciable alteration in sense³). Clearly, however, the difficulty with the shortened imperfects with *waw*-conjunctive in Da. xi 16-18 cannot be similarly resolved. As for the instances of וַיְהִי cited above, the first three are explained by DRIVER, though not entirely convincingly, as jussives, but he admits that 1 Ki. xiv 5 b, cannot be one⁴). M. LAMBERT, on the other hand, has no hesitation in declaring the four instances to be copyists' errors, the jussive being, in his opinion, inappropriate in all of them⁵). It looks as if the shortened imperfects in the instances mentioned might be a secondary development.

The fact, however, that these imperfects with *waw*-conjunctive are employed instead of the normal perfect with *waw*-consecutive, suggests that we have here essentially the same anomaly as that noted in DSIa. On this view the form וַיְהִי in the four instances cited could be equated with וַיְהִיָּה with which we are already familiar from DSIa, where it stands for the normal consecutive form וַהֲיָה. It would, moreover, be reasonable to suppose that where Jewish learned

¹) Cf. for example, 1 Ki. viii 30, 33-34, 39 and parallels in 2 Ch. vi.

²) See S. R. DRIVER, *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew* (= *Tenses*), Oxford, 1892, Appendix ii, p. 212 ff. and GK (Engl. ed., Oxford, 1910), § 109 k.

³) *Ibid.*, § 172.

⁴) *Ibid.*, § 121, Obs. 3.

⁵) *Traité de Grammaire Hébraïque*, Paris, 1946, p. 157, note 3.

tradition found the consonantal form ויהי it would treat the *waw* as conjunctive if the verb had reference to the future and, conversely, as consecutive, if the verb had reference to the past. Some support for this view is to be found perhaps in Is. xlviii 18 where in the apodosis of a hypothetical introduced by לוֹא (!) we find twice the reading וְיִהְיֶה while in DSIa the reading is once וְהָיָה and once וְיִהְיֶה. It has been attempted to find an *ad hoc* meaning for the form וְיִהְיֶה in the MT reading. We are inclined, however, to believe that the form is an error the progressive stages of which were וְהָיָה → וְיִהְיֶה → וְיִהְיֶה, the last form being rationalised by Jewish tradition, perhaps before any known school of Massoretes, into וְיִהְיֶה¹).

§ 4. *A possible relation between irregular future constructions and irregular frequentative constructions in the MT.*

The MT contains a number of frequentative constructions in which the frequentative perfects with *waw*-consecutive break off irregularly into the imperfect consecutive. DRIVER remarks in *Tenses*²) that sometimes 'when the frequentative nature of the events described has been sufficiently indicated, the writer, feeling that this circumstance does not call for *continual* prominence, reverts to the ordinary form of prose narrative as carried on by י'. In his *Notes etc. on the Books of Samuel*³) published twenty-one years later DRIVER is rather less explicit and remarks that 'Hebrew is sometimes negligent in such cases [i.e. in frequentative constructions] to maintain the frequentative tense throughout'. On the other hand G. F. MOORE⁴) in a note on Jud. vi 4 remarks, after referring to DRIVER, that the vibration between the frequentative construction and the imperfect consecutive is hardly to be explained in Jud. vi 4 ff. as a negligent lapse into simple narration.

Antecedently DRIVER's explanation is both simple and natural.

¹) F. T. KELLY, "The Imperfect with Simple Waw", *JBL*, vol. 39 (1920), p. 1 ff. deals with the whole problem in an oversimplified way. Thus, for example, Da. xi 16a constitutes in his opinion a protasis of a condition, the apodosis having a participle. Verse 16 b would, then, be a general conclusion following the preceding and the *waw* in verse 17 would relate back to verse 16. The same construction would continue in verses 18-19 (see *ibid.*, pp. 21-22).

²) § 114.

³) Oxford, 1913, p. 31, in note on 1 Sa. ii 16.

⁴) *ICC, Judges*, Edinburgh, 1903, p. 180.

Furthermore, it is now, in the light of the 4 Qumrân fragment of 1 Sa. i and ii ¹⁾ highly improbable that some special intrinsic significance need be attached to the imperfects consecutive in the middle of a frequentative passage. For in ii 20 of the fragment the normal frequentative construction lapses into the imperfect with *waw* prefixed, viz. וילך האיש למקומו ³⁾, while in another frequentative passage in ii 16 the Qumrân fragment reads וא[מ]ר for MT ויאמר ²⁾. One is beginning to suspect that it might have been the copyist rather than the writer who was 'negligent to maintain the frequentative tense throughout'. DRIVER attributes the reading ויאמר in ii 16 to negligence of the writer but admits that it 'should strictly be ואמר, in accordance with the tenses before and after' ⁴⁾. But he further agrees with GESENIUS-KAUTZSCH that ויאמר might be a scribal error for ואמר and rejects the reading ויאמר suggested by H. P. SMITH ⁵⁾, on the ground that it is against the usage of Hebrew prose. Yet, it is just possible that SMITH was nearer the truth than he knew, though his reason for recommending the reading ויאמר, namely, that it may be understood 'as stating a hypothesis' was almost certainly wrong.

The important consideration in the present discussion is the fact that formally the normal frequentative construction is identical with that employed in the OT to represent a sequence of future actions, states or events, as well as other sequences which, though not future, possess 'an element of uncertainty and indeterminateness'. It need therefore not occasion surprise that an error characteristic of the latter constructions should occur also in the former. The difficulty, however, is to decide what the state of mind of the writer or copyist was, that is to say, whether the *past* aspect of the events described or the mere awareness of the *form* of the construction, induced the lapse from the perfect consecutive into the imperfect with *waw* prefixed. This *waw* may well have been originally *waw*-conjunctive, because if Jewish tradition had, for example, the consonantal form ויאמר in the middle of a frequentative passage, it would have been

¹⁾ BASOR, No. 132 (1953), p. 15 ff.

²⁾ *Ibid.* Text and notes at p. 22, facsimile and reconstruction at p. 17 and p. 26, respectively.

³⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 21 and cf. facsimile and reconstruction.

⁴⁾ *loc. cit.*

⁵⁾ In ICC, *The Books of Samuel*, Edinburgh, 1899, p. 18.

reasonable for it to read the verb וַיֹּאמֶר, indicating thereby, however imperfectly, that the verb has no reference to the future. For all one knows, then, the *intended* reading in 1 Sam. ii 20 may well have been, though mistakenly, וַיִּלֶךְ or even וַיֵּלֶךְ. Indeed, we incline to the view that the irregular imperfects occurring in frequentative constructions originally carried the *waw*-conjunctive. The copyists, we believe, were predisposed by their linguistic background to adopt sporadically this form, just as at some stage a copyist of DSIa would occasionally lapse into this form when handling a *future* or kindred consecutive construction. This explanation would account for the paradoxical readings in 1 Sa. ii 16 and 20 of the MT and the Qumrân fragment, but so would also DRIVER's explanation advanced in *Tenses*. DRIVER's explanation is indeed the simpler and more natural, but it lacks the support of evidence from the MT or DSIa. The evidence available in non-frequentative constructions is of lapses from the perfect consecutive into the imperfect with *waw*-conjunctive ¹⁾.

§ 5. *Concluding remarks.*

a) The irregular phenomena discussed in the present study appear to show that the disintegration of the consecutive constructions had already set in at the time DSIa was copied. Neither the indiscriminate coupling of verbal clauses nor the use of the imperfect with *waw*-conjunctive in future constructions, nor, again, the use of the perfect with *waw*-conjunctive in past constructions, can be adequately explained by other suppositions. At the same time these phenomena, now exhibited by a MS centuries older than any Massoretic MS, appear to call for a revision of the prevailing conception of certain types of "scribal errors" in the sphere of syntax in the MT. These can no longer be regarded as inexplicable accidents, nor need one be informed by an otherwise commendable respect for the *lectio difficilior*, strain in every doubtful case after some elusive meaning

¹⁾ On the other hand there is some evidence outside the MT of attempts to read a *waw* as consecutive where the MT reads it as conjunctive. Thus in a fragment with Palestinian vocalisation of Da. xi all the verbs in verses 15-17 are read as consecutive (see P. KAHLE, *Masoreten des Westens*, vol. II, Stuttgart, 1930, p. 71 and p. 23*). The attempt to cure the irregularity is here patently feeble, but the readings are evidence of the relatively fluid state of pre-Massoretic tradition.

b) It may perhaps be instructive to illustrate our conclusions by applying them to the evaluation of one of the textual variants of DSIa. Let us take for our example DSIa xxvii 6, which reads **הבאים** **ישריש יעקוב ויצין ויפרח ישראל ומלאו פני תבל תנובה**. Now, the *waw* prefixed to the second verb might strike us as being pleonastic, but apart from this we would be justified in regarding the last two verbs as synonyms and the construction as a whole, as normal. Knowing, however, the syndetic tendencies of DSIa, as well as its notable tendency to use the imperfect with *waw*-conjunctive where Biblical Hebrew normally employs the perfect with *waw*-consecutive, we should probably prefer the present MT reading **יָצִין וּפָרַח**. Yet precisely because of our knowledge of the DSIa syndetic tendency, we cannot exclude the mere theoretical possibility that the original reading was the asyndetic **יָצִין יִפְרַח**, which would perhaps be no less effective than the MT reading. Moreover, such a relation between two readings is actually found in xlix 7, where MT reads **יִרְאוּ מַלְכִּים** while DSIb has **יִרְאוּ יְקוֹמוּ** ¹⁾. Yet despite the fact that the verb *šiš* and *pārah* do occur in the OT as synonyms, the problem could be resolved in favour of the MT reading even against the improved version **יָצִין ויִפְרַח**. For the MT reading would, we believe, accord better with the picture of the progressive states of taking root, blossoming, flourishing and filling the face of the world with fruit. The DSIa tendencies in the use of the verb discussed in the present study are, of course, not the only factors to be taken into consideration where a verbal form in the MT is in doubt. For example, the opinion held by GEIGER and LUZZATTO that the reading **וַיִּקְרָא** in Is. ix 5 is tendentious and was originally **וַיִּקְרָא** ²⁾ would, when tested in the light of the DSIa reading **וִקְרָא**, involve the following considerations: 1) That DSIa is often disposed to use an active form for a passive form used in the MT in an impersonal sense ³⁾. 2) That DSIa exhibits ever so slight a tendency to use the perfect with *waw*-conjunctive where MT uses an imperfect with *waw*-consecutive,

¹⁾ *Megillôth Genâzôth*, II, Jerusalem, 1950, plate xvii, line 18.

²⁾ S. D. LUZZATTO, *Il Profeta Isaiah*, Padova, 1867, addendum at p. 195.

³⁾ For example, i 26; iii 11 (l); v 8 (?); xiv 3, 20; xvi 10; xxviii 18 (the additional accusative particle suggests an active form of the verb); xxxii 5 **יִקְרָאוּ** and *ibid.*, **וַיֹּאמֶר**; xxxv 8; xlviii 8; xlix 24, 25; lviii 12; lxi 3 and lxii 2. It is doubtful whether DSIa contains a single instance of the passive of the qal of *qārā*.

and 3) that, after all, the DSIa form might be that of a perfect with *waw*-consecutive. The first mentioned tendency is, however, so very prominent in DSIa that, taken in conjunction with the corresponding reading in the ancient Versions, it would argue strongly in favour of וַיִּקְרָא as the original reading. This would certainly be preferable to the impersonal consecutive forms וּקְרָא or וַיִּקְרָא.

THE CHRISTIAN INTERPRETATION OF THE SIGN × IN THE ISAIAH SCROLL

BY

J. L. TEICHER

Cambridge

The correct interpretation of the sign ×, placed eleven times in the margins of the Isaiah Scroll to mark significant passages, is a matter of extreme importance for establishing the origin of the Scroll. In the paper I published two years ago in the *Journal of Jewish Studies* (III, 1952, pp. 128-130), I contended that the sign is the Greek letter *chi*, an abbreviation for *Christos*—supplying us thus with “material evidence” that “the Scroll was written, or at least provided with signs, by a Jewish-Christian scribe”. In a recent number of *V.T.* (IV, 1 1954, pp. 90-94), Dr. I. SONNE has vigorously contested my findings and rejected the interpretation of the sign × as a Christian sign that I advanced. Although I am second to none in admiration of Dr. SONNE’s scholarly work and am very reluctant to engage in polemics with him, the importance of the problem is too great for me to refrain from examining critically his arguments against my contention. If I do it at what might appear to be considerable length, my justification is that in the course of this examination further aspects of the problem of the sign will be revealed and questions of scientific method illuminated.

If I understand Dr. SONNE rightly, he rejects the Christian interpretation of the sign × on the ground that it is possible to interpret the sign otherwise, and in no less than three different ways. Let me now examine each of these possibilities in turn.

1) The sign × is not the Greek letter *chi* but the Hebrew *taw*. Here I quote Dr. SONNE himself: ‘What is now the symbolic meaning of the Hebrew *Taw*? By a curious coincidence, it corresponds precisely to one of many symbolic meanings of the Greek *chi*. Among the “notariaca”, signs, collected by SIXTUS SENENSIS in his *Bibliotheca Santa* [read: *Sancta*] from the writings of the Church Fathers, we find under No. 13: “×-Charakter”, meaning mark, figure, serving to

single out passages containing doctrines peculiar to a certain philosophical or theological school. Now, *Taw* in Hebrew means practically the same as *charakter*, namely mark. As a sign, therefore, the Hebrew *Taw* could be the exact equivalent of the Greek *chi* in the meaning of *charakter*. In our Isaiah Scroll it might indicate passages which appealed particularly to the members of the sect, either for their eschatological perspective or for their religious tenets or practices' (p. 91).

The attentive reader will not fail to notice a significant shift in the formulation of Dr. SONNE's statements. At the beginning of the quoted passage he asserts in positive terms that the Hebrew *taw* "corresponds precisely to one of the many symbolic meanings of the Greek *chi*", but towards the end he expresses himself more doubtfully: "the Hebrew *Taw* could be the exact equivalent of the Greek *chi*" and "it might indicate passages etc.". The latter formulation can hardly be contested; of course it *could* and it *might*, but as a matter of fact we do not know that it ever was or did. We enter here the realm of imaginary possibilities and the question must be asked whether or not imaginary possibilities should be advanced as valid arguments in discussing evidence.

One thing at least is certain. The sign \times in the Isaiah Scroll has nothing to do with the "charakter" described by SIXTUS. According to Dr. SONNE, the latter indicates that \times serves "to single out passages containing doctrines peculiar to a certain philosophical or theological school". But this is not what SIXTUS says. Here are his own words: " \times , character, hoc est stylus, figura vel sicut Gellius interpretatur, genus dicendi cuilibet auctori peculiare. Hac nota, ut scribit Diogenes Laertius, solebant Platonici in libris Platonis annotare phrases et locutiones Platoni proprias et electiores. Quod et olim in scriptis Gregorij Nazianzeni, studiosos quosdam Gregoriani characteris annotatores factitasse testatur in Collectaneis Stratonicus" (*Bibliotheca Sancta*, Venice 1566, p. 257). I have to confess that I have not succeeded in identifying Gellius and Stratonicus. FR. Pio-Thomas MILITANTE, who annotated the Naples edition, 1742, of the *Bibliotheca Sancta*, writes on p. 199, note a: "quis fuerit Stratonicus iste, quem bis laudat N. Sixtus, omnino ignotum"—and I could not check SIXTUS' statements. Diogenes Laertius, the only ancient author quoted, writes as follows: "And since certain critical marks are affixed to his [Plato's] works let us now say a word about these. The *chi* is taken to indicate peculiar expressions and figures of speech, and generally any idiom of Platonic usage; the *diple* ($>$) calls attention

to doctrines and opinions characteristic of Plato; the dotted *chi* ($\dot{\chi}$) denotes select passages and χ beauties of style" (III, 65-66). The English translation is reproduced here with slight changes from *The Loeb Classical Library*, Diogenes Laertius, I, pp. 334-335. SIXTUS, then, in his description of the sign \times , states that its use was limited to indicating phrases and expressions peculiar to Plato, and—if his sources can be trusted—to marking the stylistic characteristics of Gregory of Nazianz or in general of any author. The description throws no light on the meaning of the sign \times in the Isaiah Scroll, since no stylistic peculiarity of the prophet is marked by it.

Dr. SONNE's statement that SIXTUS describes the sign \times as a mark "to single out passages containing doctrines peculiar to a certain philosophical or theological school" thus finds no support in his source. How then did he come to make this statement? I submit that, in consulting SIXTUS, he must have nodded and his eyes wandered to another passage in his source, a passage which reads as follows: " $\times \times$, CHARACTER duplicatus: hoc signo ut refert Diogenes, in operibus Platoniciis assumebatur ad designandas opiniones et dogmata Platoni propria, in quibus ipse a caeteris philosophis omnino dissentiret. Hanc notam in Origenis voluminibus posuerunt Gregorius Nazianzenus, et Basilius, ad indicandum peculiaria eius dogmata a communi patrum definitione discrepantia". (*Bibliotheca Sancta*, Venice 1566, p. 257). Dr. SONNE has obviously transferred SIXTUS' description of the double sign $\times \times$ to that of the single \times , and has in addition given a general purport to the qualified statement in the source which refers specifically to the opinions of Plato and Origen only. The double sign $\times \times$ has, in conclusion, no obvious connection with the single sign \times in the Isaiah Scroll.

It is interesting to note that SIXTUS and the authors on whom he relied understood the expression *diple* in Diogenes Laertius to refer to the double $\times \times$, while the translator of Diogenes in *The Loeb Classical Library* (p. 334, note a) explains the expression as referring to a "wedge-shaped $>$, used in early papyri to denote a fresh paragraph". Since Diogenes Laertius makes no mention of a "fresh paragraph", but "of doctrines and opinions characteristic of Plato", the interpretation of *diple* presented by SIXTUS and his authorities appears to be the correct one. This matter falls, however, within the province of a Greek paleographer; all that requires to be said is that the possibility of any connection between the signs described by SIXTUS and the sign \times in the Isaiah Scroll can be safely eliminated.

2) The second possibility suggested by Dr. SONNE is that the sign \times in the Isaiah Scroll is in fact the Greek *chi*. But—to quote Dr. SONNE again: “. . . if it should be the Greek letter *chi* then an ordinary Greek dictionary might be of more help to decipher the meaning than Epiphanius. There, in fact, we find that among the many functions of the letter *chi* it was also used to mark fine, useful passages in a book, in which case it stood for *chreston*, good, useful, important” (p. 92).

Let us then consult “an ordinary Greek dictionary”. The latest edition of the standard *Greek-English Lexicon* by LIDDEL and SCOTT has no reference at all to \times as an abbreviation of *chreston*. But in the fifth edition (1864) of the *Lexicon*, we read on p. 1586 as follows: “ χ was used by Gramm. and Critics to mark a passage or book as spurious, Menag. Diog. L. 3.65, 66, cf. $\chi\acute{\iota}\alpha\zeta\omega$, $\chi\iota\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$; but with points on each side, ($\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\gamma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\nu$), $\cdot\chi\cdot$, it was used to mark fine passages, and in this case stood for $\chi\rho\acute{\eta}\sigma\tau\omicron\nu$, $\chi\rho\acute{\eta}\sigma\iota\mu\omicron\nu$ —since passages so marked might make up a $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\tau\omicron\mu\alpha\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$ ”. If we recall to mind the passage from Diogenes Laertius, III, 65, 66, quoted above, we cannot fail to observe the confusion in the *Lexicon*. There is no mention in Diogenes Laertius of the use of χ “to mark a passage or a book as spurious”, or of the χ *periestigmenon* as an abbreviation of *chreston*. The letter χ is mentioned only as a mark to denote “select passages and beauties of style” in Plato’s writings. It would appear that the only authority for the statement that χ served as an abbreviation of *chreston* is the confusion in the *Lexicon*, and it is therefore not surprising that this entry was omitted from the latest edition. The possibility that the sign \times in the Isaiah Scroll may be an abbreviation of *chrestos* can be safely eliminated too, since in any case the sign \times in the Scroll is not provided “with points on each side”.

Before proceeding to discuss the third possibility suggested by Dr. SONNE for the meaning of the sign \times , it may be opportune to consider the conclusion he draws from the erroneous assumption that \times is an abbreviation of *chreston*. He writes as follows: “In our Isaiah Scroll again \times would simply mark certain passages, not necessarily of christological nature, as having particular significance for the members of the sect” (p. 92). There is fortunately no need to lose ourselves in speculation as to the kind of passages that are marked by the sign \times in the Isaiah Scroll. In fact, only christological passages are so marked. Dr. SONNE, it is true, denies that the sign \times

on Plate XLVI of the Scroll refers to a christological passage. "We would not be forced", he says, "to impose christological meanings upon passages dealing with the observance of the Sabbath" (p. 92). It would be so indeed if we chose with Dr. SONNE to isolate a single passage and to pay no attention to the whole section of Isaiah that is marked on Plate XLVI. The section, marked twice by the sign X, comprises the verses 1-7 of Chapter lvi. It begins: "Thus says the Lord: Keep ye judgment and do justice, for my salvation is near to come, and my righteousness to be revealed". And it ends: "For mine house shall be called an house of prayer for all people". The christological purport of this section of Isaiah is patent, and Dr. SONNE, who missed it, must have nodded again when he consulted the prophet.

There is yet another point to consider in connection with the signs in the margin of Plate XLVI. Apart from the two signs marking Isaiah lvi 1-7, there is a third sign X in the same margin, which, I explained in my paper in the *Journal of Jewish Studies*, belongs to Plate XLV where it refers to the christological passage, Isaiah lv 3 ff. Dr. SONNE contests this explanation, regarding it as "entirely gratuitous" (p. 92, n. 2). Is it in fact so? Let us examine again the first two signs in the margin of Plate XLVI. They are placed actually in the middle of the margin between Plates XLV and XLVI and they refer to Isaiah lvi 1-7 (on Plate XLVI), a christological passage, and at the same time to Isaiah liv 11-16 (on Plate XLV), also a christological passage. Again, the two signs in the margin between Plates XXXIV and XXXV refer to the christological passages Isaiah xli 8-10, Isaiah xlii 1 f., right and left respectively. Surely it is a matter of indifference whether the sign X is placed to the right or to the left of the passages as long as the christological purport of these is obvious. It would be different, of course, if we were to assume that a law of nature compelled the placing of the sign X to the right of the passages; but would not such an assumption be entirely gratuitous? In any case, it is enough to inspect the disputed sign X in the margin between Plates XLV and XLVI in order to perceive that it is placed very close to line 24 of Plate XLV and just above the word ידעכה of line 25. The scribe has left no room for doubt that the sign belongs to Plate XLV.

3. As the third possibility of interpreting the sign X in the Isaiah Scroll, Dr. SONNE, concedes that the sign may be an abbreviation for *Christos*, but he still refuses to admit, even in this case, that it would

be a Christian sign. It may have been, according to him, a sign used by an Jewish "messianic" sect, and he concludes—to quote his own words: 'It would therefore be perfectly in order for members of any "messianic" sect, whether of the pre-Christian period or of the second century C. E. to mark the "christological", messianic passages in Isaiah referring them to their respective Messiah'. (p. 93). The line of argument pursued here by Dr. SONNE can be neither proved nor disproved. It is, of course, possible to imagine that a Jewish sect might have used the sign \times to mark "messianic" passages, but there is no evidence whatever that such a sect actually existed nor even any ground for assuming that such a sect might have existed. Strictly speaking, the statement that a Jewish sect of such a description, about which nothing is known, might have existed is meaningless; nothing but a mere imaginary possibility is asserted by it. This raises again the question, whether or not imaginary possibilities should be advanced as valid arguments in discussing evidence.

The Christian interpretation of the sign \times in the Isaiah Scroll is based on evidence, not on imaginary possibilities. The mere presence of this sign in a religious object (in the broadest sense), and such is undoubtedly the text of Isaiah, is *prima facie* evidence that \times stands for *Christos*, particularly as the sign marks christological passages. The testimony of Epiphanius, whom I quoted in my paper in the *Journal of Jewish Studies* and who states explicitly that Christian copyists marked christological passages in the Prophets with the sign \times , transforms the *prima facie* evidence into an indubitable certainty. In a short note appended to his paper, Dr. SONNE denies however that Epiphanius stated this. "One might argue", Dr. SONNE writes, "that the fact that Epiphanius related expressly of the Christian custom to mark such places [christological] may lend some support, though not decisive evidence, to TEICHER's identification. This might have been so, if the signs were identical; but they are not". (p. 94 n. 3). While reading my paper, Dr. SONNE must have nodded for a third time, for I explicitly warned the reader (on p. 128) that in the late Greek MSS. of Epiphanius the form of the signs might have been changed by the copyists, but that, in the sixth century MS. of the Syriac version of Epiphanius' work, the signs may be closer in form to the original. As regards the sign under discussion, the Greek MSS. present it in the form of a cross $+$, but the Syriac MS. has the form \times , identical with the sign in the Isaiah Scroll. It is also just as well to remember, as I pointed out in my paper, that Epiphanius

explains the sign as standing for *Christos*, implying that it was originally X, and that other Christian marginal signs in his work coincide with those appearing in the margin of the Isaiah Scroll; (these are not mentioned by Dr. SONNE).

The question, whether or not Epiphanius' testimony is to be regarded, according to Dr. SONNE, as "some support", not as "decisive evidence", cannot be discussed, since Dr. SONNE has omitted to indicate his criteria for distinguishing between "support" and "evidence". But his final argument against the Christian interpretation of the sign X calls for some comment. Dr. SONNE writes as follows: "Secondly there is a negative instance which TEICHER failed to mention and to account for. I refer to the absence of the X-sign at the chapters xi, liii, lxi. If Christians put the sign in order to mark the Isaiah prophecies referred to Jesus, they could hardly have skipped these chapters which form the oldest standard testimonies" (p. 94 n. 3). Here Dr. SONNE must have nodded for the fourth time. I indicated in my paper that certain passages in the Isaiah Scroll are marked with horizontal bars singling out "significant passages referring to the messianic hopes, doctrine and history of the Jewish-Christian sect". I gave a list of the Plates in which the bars appear, including the Plates X (Is. Ch. xi), XLIV (Ch. liii) and L (Ch. lxi), and chapter xi was in addition specially discussed. (From this list, Plate LV was omitted by inadvertence). The chapters referred to by Dr. SONNE are thus marked in the Scroll, although not by X; they must therefore have had some special significance for the sect. The reason why these passages are marked by horizontal bars, not by X, is perhaps the circumstance that the passages do not refer directly to the person of the Messiah, but to "messianic hopes" in general. The new and as yet unpublished material found in the Qumran caves may perhaps supply us with the exact reason. In any case, Dr. SONNE's argument that chapters xi, liii, lxi, should have been marked by X, because they represent the "oldest standard testimonies", begs the question. The "oldest standard testimonies" which Dr. SONNE has in mind are those of Catholic Christians, but the annotator of the Isaiah Scroll was, as stated in my paper, a Jewish Christian, who was not likely to use "standard testimonies".

To conclude: The critical examination of Dr. SONNE's paper has shown that his rejection of the Christian interpretation of the sign X in the Isaiah Scroll rests upon one and only one argument, that is, the imaginary possibility that an unknown Jewish sect might have

also used the sign. I hope it will not be considered temerity on my part if I declare that the validity of this argument cannot be admitted. I should like to state, however, that Dr. SONNE has done a signal service to scholarship by publishing his attempt to disprove the Christian interpretation of the sign \times ; he could not have shown more convincingly that this interpretation is incontrovertible.

Dr. SONNE has earned the gratitude of scholars for another reason too, by suggesting that the sign \times in the Isaiah Scroll may be the Hebrew letter *taw* (in the ancient script). This is a most valuable suggestion, which prompts us to ask the question, whether a sect in fact existed that adopted the Hebrew *taw* as a meaningful sign. The answer to this question is supplied by a source that is surprisingly close at hand, the Damascus Fragments. Here on p. 2 (MS.B) the idea is put forward in a passage which reproduces in part the beginning of Chapter ix of Ezekiel, that at the time of the Last Judgment, when the Messiah comes, certain circumstances which accompanied the destruction of Jerusalem, as described by the prophet, will be repeated—namely, that only those whose foreheads have been marked will be saved. The text of the passage reads as follows: והשומרים אותו הם עניי הצאן אלה ימלטו בקץ הפקודה והנשואים ימסרו לחרב בבוא משיח אהרן וישראל כאשר היה בקץ פקדת הראשון אשר אמר ביד יחזקאל להתות התיו על מצחות נאנחים ונאנקים והנשואים הסגרו לחרב נוקמת נקם הברית.

‘But those who pay heed to Him, are “the poor of the flock”; they will be saved at the time of the Last Judgment and all the others will be consigned to the sword when the Messiah of Aaron and Israel comes—in the same manner as it happened during the first time of Judgment, when (God) ordered through Ezekiel that the foreheads of those who sigh and groan should be marked with the *taw*, while all the others were consigned to the sword, avenging (the breach) of the covenant’.

This quotation of Ezekiel ix 4, contains a slight but very significant divergence from the MT: instead of the expression תו it has התיו with the definite article, which can mean only the letter *taw*. This reading may represent an original variant underlying the versions of Aquila and Theodotion, who transcribed the expression as *to thau* (if the gloss in FIELD, *Hexapla* II, p. 791, is to be trusted—Jerome mentions only Theodotion). Be this as it may, the important thing about this passage is that it implies clearly that the members of the sect of the Fragments had their foreheads marked with the letter

taw, which they regarded as an emblem guaranteeing their salvation on the day of the Last Judgment. The form of the *taw* was X, as in the ancient Hebrew alphabet, the only one that could have been used by the prophet Ezekiel. (Both the Jewish and the Christian traditions considered the form of the *taw* to have been X as is shown by the sources discussed by Professor S. LIEBERMANN in his *Greek in Jewish Palestine*, pp. 185-191).

What, then, is the sect of the Damascus Fragments that adopted the custom of signing the foreheads of its members (certainly at baptism) with X as an emblem of salvation, and what is the meaning of this sign? The answer to these questions is supplied by Revelation, which, in a manner identical with that of the Fragments, regards Ezekiel's vision of the events during the destruction of Jerusalem as the mould from which the events on the day of the Last Judgment will be cast, and insists that only those whose foreheads have been signed will be saved and none other: "And I saw another angel ascending from the east, having the seal of the living God: and he cried with a loud voice to the four angels, to whom it was given to hurt the earth and the sea. Saying, Hurt not the earth, neither the sea, nor the trees, till we have sealed the servants of our God in their foreheads" (vii 2-3). "And it was commanded them (the locusts and scorpions) that they should not hurt the grass of the earth, neither any green thing, neither any tree; but only those men who have not the Seal of God in their foreheads" (~~ix~~ 4). Two further passages of Revelation suggest that the form of "the seal of God", the sign of salvation impressed upon the foreheads of those who will be saved, was X, the abbreviation of the name *Christos*: "And there shall be no more curse: but the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it; and his servants shall serve him. And they shall see his face; and *his name shall be in their foreheads*" (xxii 3-4). "And I looked, and, lo, a Lamb stood on the mount Sion, and with him an hundred forty and four thousand, having *his name and his Father's name written in their foreheads*" (xiv 1). The exhaustive and proper interpretation of these passages in Revelation is, needless to say, a most difficult undertaking and I shall certainly not attempt it here. But one point appears to be beyond doubt: the typological exploitation of Chapter ix of Ezekiel by the author of Revelation. This leads to the conclusion that at least one train of his thought was the association of *taw*, X, in Ezekiel with *Christos*. This is as much as needs to be said here (I hope to deal at greater length with the whole problem on another

occasion) in order to draw attention to the congruity between the conception of the Damascus Fragments and Revelation—a congruity which proves that the sect of the Damascus Fragments was Christian and used the sign X as an abbreviation of *Christos*.

The conclusions affirmed by the re-examination of the problem of the sign X in the Isaiah Scroll are, thus, that this sign is in origin the ancient Hebrew *taw*, as derived from the text of Ezekiel, and that its meaning is *Christos*. This might appear too complicated to be correct; but fortunately we find a parallel phenomenon among the Rabbis who, as shown by Professor LIEBERMANN, attached a Greek meaning to the sign X (viewed as the Greek letter *chi*) and at the same time regarded the sign as the ancient Hebrew letter *taw*. If this was good enough for the Rabbis, there is no cause to wonder, as Dr. SONNE does (p. 91), why the Judaeo-Christians of the Isaiah Scroll should have had “a system of signs based on Greek letters and terms.”

SHORT NOTES

THE TEXT OF HOSEA IX 8

This verse, a notable crux, reads in the M.T.:

צָפָה אֶפְרַיִם עִם־אֱלֹהֵי נָבִיא
פַּח יָקוֹשׁ עַל־כָּל־דִּרְכָיו מִשְׁטָמָה בְּבֵית־אֱלֹהֵיוּ:

The LXX. renders it thus:

σκοπὸς Εφραιμ μετὰ θεοῦ · προφήτης, παγὶς σκολιὰ ἐπὶ πάσας τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ · μανίαν ἐν οἴκῳ κυρίου κατέπηξαν.

The Targum reads:

מסכן בית ישראל די יתקיים להון פולחן טעותא לבנייהון קולין צלן על-כל-
אורחתהון מסנ תקלא בבית מקדשא דאלההון:

The Hexapla notes the following readings:

cum deo meo. 'A : Σ : ἐμοί : = Syro-Hex. .

O' : μετὰ θεοῦ.

The main difficulty of the verse is in the first line, as may be seen from the conflicting constructions of the different words.

צָפָה has been interpreted syntactically in three ways:

1) As a noun in the absolute state:

a) = watcher: LXX, Peshitto, Jerome (*Commentarii in duodecim prophetas*, Paris 1546), CALVIN (*Praelectiones in duodecim prophetas*, Geneva 1591, p. 110-111), LUTHER (*Die Heilige Schrift*), GROTIUS (*Annotata ad Vetus Testamentum*, Paris 1644, Vol. II, in his translation, though he discusses other possibilities in his notes), PUSEY (*The Minor Prophets with a Commentary*, London 1865, Vol. I., though he admits other possible renderings), HORTON (*Century Bible*, Edinburgh 1901), BROWN (*Westminster Commentary*, London 1932), RV, and Soncino OT.

b) = spier: UMBREIT (*Praktischer Commentar über die kleinen Propheten*, Vol I, 1844), EWALD (*Die Propheten des Alten Bundes*, ed. 2, 1867), ORELLI (*Die zwölf kleinen Propheten*, ed. 3, München 1908).

2) As a noun in the construct state: AV, Samuel, Lord Bishop of ROCHESTER (*Hosea*, London 1801), PUSEY (*op. cit.*), in his translation, CHEYNE (*Hosea with Notes and Introduction*, Cambridge 1884), HARPER (*Amos and Hosea*, Edinburgh 1905), EHRLICH (*Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel*, Vol. 5, Leipzig 1912), MOFFATT (*A New*

Translation of the Bible, London 1926), RSV. All except HARPER and MOFFATT claim that it governs Ephraim: they regard it as governing God. NOWACK, in a reconstructed text, construes it in the genitive (cf. *infra*).

3) As the participle of a verb:

a) = looking out for, or expecting: Targum, GESENIUS (*The-saurus*, Lipsiae 1829), HENDERSON (*The Book of the Twelve Minor Prophets*, 1845), SIMSON (*Der Prophet Hosea erklärt und übersetzt*, 1851), HITZIG (*Die zwölf kleinen Propheten*, ed. 2, Leipzig 1852), WÜNSCHE (*Der Prophet Hosea*, Leipzig 1868).

b) = spying on or against: KEIL (*Commentary on the Twelve Minor Prophets*, in KEIL and DELITZSCH's *Biblischer Commentar*, 1866), MICHAELIS (*Deutsche Übersetzung des Alten Testaments*, mit Anmerkungen, 1872), G. A. SMITH (*The Book of the Twelve Prophets*, 1896), DUHM (*Anmerkungen zu den zwölf Propheten*, Giessen 1911, pp. 29-30, and *Israels Propheten*, Tübingen 1922, p. 98), SELIN (*Das Zwölfprophetenbuch*, Kommentar zum Alten Testament, Leipzig 1929), PROCKSCH (*Biblia Hebraica*, ed. 3, 1933, according to the implication of the foot-notes), ROBINSON (*Die zwölf kleinen Propheten*, Handbuch zum Alten Testament, Tübingen 1938), and KÖHLER-BAUMGARTNER (*Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*, 1953).

The Jewish interpreters, Rashi, Ibn Ezra, and Kimḥi, offer no linguistic comment.

צפה in conjunction with עם-אלהי has been construed as follows:

1) a) watcher with my God: Jerome, GROTIUS, PUSEY, HORTON, BROWN, Soncino OT, AV, RV.

b) watcher joined to my God, speaking only the words God gives: CALVIN, LUTHER, STÜCK (*Hoseas Propheta*, Leipzig 1828), and, as a possibility, PUSEY.

c) watcher appointed by my God: Jerome in his comments, (*Deus principes dedit ut populum corripere delinquentem et ad rectam viam retraherent*), CHEYNE, and MOFFATT. Here עם is interpreted as נָעֵם.

d) looks out for prophecy with my God: WÜNSCHE.

e) looks for prophecy from my God: STÜCK.

f) looks outside of my God for prophecy, as in GESENIUS, KEIL, and HITZIG, who repeat the viewpoint of the Jewish commentators, as may be seen from their pronouncements ad. loc. (*Rabbinical Bible*, Miqra'ot Gedolot, Warsaw 1866).

Rashi: הם מעמידין להם נביאיהם הממשיכין אותם לצד עבודת אלילים שלהם:

(They set up their own prophets, who lead them to their own idols).

Ibn Ezra: הטעם כי נביא השם הוא אויל והוא עושה מעצמו צופה והוא כמו

נביא:

(The sense is, the prophet of God is a fool, who makes himself a seer, he thinks himself a prophet).

Kimhi: אפרים שם לו צופה עם-אלהיו והוא נביא השקר

(Ephraim has made himself a seer beside his God; that is, the lying prophet).

g) looks outside of my God for counsel and help: DATHE (*Prophetæ minores*, 1773), and SIMSON.

h) expects help from God: HENDERSON.

i) consults with my God: MAURER (*Commentarius grammaticus criticus in Vetus Testamentum*, Leipzig 1838), who interprets the clause conditionally, with אִם understood.

j) spies against my God: UMBREIT, EWALD, ORELLI, and G. A. SMITH.

2) עַם has been pointed עָם: hence has arisen the phrase "the people of my God", which is regarded as a) standing in apposition to Ephraim, by GROTIUS, EHRLICH, and RSV, or b) governed by צִפֵּה verbally, by EICHHORN (*Die Hebräischen Propheten*, 1816: "A prophet looks into the future for God's people", צִפֵּה with the accusative being interpreted as meaning aliquem contemplari or explorare), MICHAELIS, and PROCKSCH.

3) The consonantal text has been modified:

a) אֱלֹהֵי has been changed to אֱלֹהִים by LXX, Syro-Hexaplar, and O'.

b) ROCHESTER, on the basis of two MSS. of KENNICOTT, and one originally of DE ROSSI's, proposes that אֱלֹהֵי should read אֱלֹהִי.

c) עם-אלהי has been omitted by HARPER, DUHM, and NOWACK, (*Die kleinen Propheten*, Handkommentar zum Alten Testament, Göttingen 1897), who make the following reconstructions in the text:

HARPER: מִשְׁטֶמֶת הַצִּפֵּה אֶפְרַיִם

DUHM: צִפֵּה בְּבֵית-אֱלֹהֵי אֶפְרַיִם אֶל-הַנְּבִיא

NOWACK: מִשְׁטֶמֶת הַצִּפֵּה בְּבֵית אֱלֹהֵי

d) More radical proposals are suggested by OETTLI (*Amos und Hosea*, Gütersloh 1901), MARTI (*Dodekapropheten*, Kurzer Hand-

kommentar zum Alten Testament, 1903), whose rendering is noted and commended by NOWACK in *Biblia Hebraica*, ed. 2; and SELLIN, who is followed by PROCKSCH, ROBINSON, and WEISER (*Das AT Deutsch*).

OETTLI: פָּצָה פֹּה אֶפְרַיִם עַל-נְבִיא

MARTI: יָדַע יִשְׂרָאֵל קִצְפִּי יָדַע אֶפְרַיִם וְעָמִי

SELLIN: צָפָה אֶפְרַיִם עִם-אֱהֵל נְבִיא

1) is accepted as following the athnah of אֱלֹהִי by: LXX, Targum, Peshitto, Kimḥi, CALVIN, LUTHER, GROTIUS, DATHE, ROCHESTER, STÜCK, GESENIUS, UMBREIT, HENDERSON, EWALD, MAURER, SIMSON, HITZIG, PUSEY, KEIL, WÜNSCHE, BAER (*Masoretic Text*, Lipsiae 1891), G. A. SMITH, NOWACK, HORTON, MARTI, BROWN, WEISER, Soncino OT, and the English versions apart from RSV.

2) is regarded as having athnah after its final vowel by: Jerome, EICHHORN, CHEYNE, OETTLI, DUHM, EHRLICH, MOFFATT, SELLIN, PROCKSCH, ROBINSON, and RSV.

The prophet is thus regarded as watching Ephraim or as watched by Ephraim, as sharing God's function of vigilance in relation to His people, and as so united with Him in spirit that he almost inevitable speaks His truth, or as so divorced from God that he depends on other truth than His and other Gods than Him, or as actively spying on God.

It is difficult however to derive appropriate or sufficient sense from any of these renderings. The immediate context does not seem to concern either God or the people of God. It does, on the other hand, concern the lot of the prophet. For this reason NOWACK, OETTLI, HARPER, MARTI and DUHM appear justified in doubting the authenticity of עִם-אֱלֹהִי, though the reconstructions of the first four are somewhat complex. SELLIN's neat transposition of consonants does not yield a happy suggestion: אֱהֵל seems an intrusion into the text. DUHM's emendation fits the mood of the oracle more adequately.

It is possible that the original text may have been: צָפָה אֶפְרַיִם אֶל-חַיֵּי נְבִיא

This would be rendered: "Ephraim spies on a prophet's life".

The vindication of this proposal would be favoured by the following arguments:

1) צַפָּה רָשָׁע is used in precisely this sense in Ps. xxxvii 32: צַפָּה רָשָׁע

לְצַדִּיק וּמִבְקֵשׁ לְהַמִּיתוֹ: (The wicked spieth upon the righteous, and seeketh to kill him.) This translation is accepted for Ps. xxxviii 32 by Francis BROWN (*Hebrew and English Lexicon to the Old Testament*, by BROWN, DRIVER, and BRIGGS) and BRIGGS (*The Book of Psalms*, ICC Commentary, 1906), though DE WETTE, BAETHGEN, KAUTZSCH, GUNKEL, and KITTEL render by "lauern auf", PEROWNE and BOYLAN by "lie in wait", BARNES by "watch", DELITZSCH by "zu schaden lauert".

2) The verse now makes excellent sense, conforming indeed to the demands of NOWACK, BROWN, and SELLIN, as to its main purport, and provides an apt parallel to the remainder of the sentence.

3) The disparity between this reading and the MT. may be explained in terms of scribal carelessness, in virtue of which the ח of חיי was written as ה: such an error in reading and transcription was equally possible before the square character became established in Hebrew. The consonants would then read: אֱלֹהֵי. This would necessitate an additional word to complete the meaning of the line, so that עַם would be introduced, and אֱלֹהֵי modified to suit its new context. Its intrusive character, however, is indicated by the fact that עַם it does not lend cogency to אֱלֹהֵי, or conform to the usage of צַפָּה, which is found with לְ, אֶל, בְּ, or the direct accusative, or the pronominal suffix, and that as עַם it disturbs the trend of the argument.

4) The irregular form of the verse as a whole need not constitute an insuperable argument against its validity. Verse 7 is not less irregular, and verse 9 with different poetic form continues the passionate utterance of the prophet.

University of St. Andrews (Scotland)

ROBERT DOBBIE

ZU PSALM lxviii 3a

In seiner jüngst erschienenen Arbeit über Psalm lxviii (*The Hebrew Union College Annual*, Vol. 13, 1950/51. S. 1 ff.) versucht W. F. ALBRIGHT auf S. 17 die Lesart *tindop* des MT als richtig zu deuten: "The third person feminine singular agrees with the two words for "foes" in the preceding cola. In Canaanite and early Hebrew masculine plurals were often construed with fem. sing. verbs where their meaning was clearly collective".

Da es sich bei „Foes“ *nicht* um einen kollektiven Ausdruck im üblichen Sinne handelt, scheint mir diese Deutung nicht möglich zu sein.

Ich glaube, dass wir im Hinblick auf das Ugaritische diese Form anders erklären können, ohne auch nur einen Konsonanten des Textes ändern zu müssen (wohl aber die Vokale): wozu wir m.E. umsomehr berechtigt sind, als Psalm lxviii auch sonst noch mehrfach Anklänge an das ugaritische Sprachgut aufweist. Ich fasse *tndp* als Niphal Impf. Pl. 3. m. auf, mit dem aus dem Ugaritischen und aus dem Kana'anäischen der El-Amarna-Briefe bekannten Präfix *t-* (das auch schon an anderen Stellen des Alten Testaments nachgewiesen wurde: Hi. xix 15. Ez. xxxvii 7. Jer. ii 19. Dt. v 23. f. cf. GORDON, *JBL* 1951. S. 160. — *Ugar. Handbook* I. S. 63). Ich lese diese Vershälfte also: *kehinnaḏep* (Ni. Inf. c.) *‘ašan tinnadeḏu* (Ni. Impf. Pl. 3. m.) „wie Rauch verweht wird, (so) sollen sie verweht werden“.

Bonn

A. JIRKU

FLESH, COVERING, AND RESPONSE, EX. xxi 10

In the words *š'êrâb ke'sûtâb w'ônâtâb lô' yigrâ'*, the Covenant-Code forbids a man to diminish three rights of his 'inferior wife' (rather than 'slave-concubine': every wife was *bought*, and the secondary partners had a legal status no less rigidly determined than that of the primary spouse). These three rights are universally interpreted to be 'food, clothing, intercourse'; but commentators are embarrassed to account for the unusual words chosen in all three cases.

Š'êrâb means 'her flesh'. *Š'êr* is used only of living flesh in the Bible, probably even in Ps. lxxviii 20, 27, since in verse 25 'meat' is unequivocally *šêdâ*. In Mi. iii 3 also, living human flesh is meant, though outraged by cannibals. In Ugaritic [GORDON 49 : II : 35, 37] *šir* occurs three times in the sense of 'flesh' (or 'remnant') rather than meat, though similarly used of cannibalism; Akkadian *šeru* in Hammurabi's prologue and epilogue means 'well-being'. Meat was a rarity in the diet of less-privileged Israelites, and would scarcely be singled out as one of a woman's three fundamental rights. Just as biblical *š'êr* means 'blood-relation' either abstractly or concretely, especially in 'flesh of his flesh' *š'êr b'sârô* Lv. xviii 6, so *bâšâr* means 'living things collectively'; but *bâšâr* means also or primarily 'meat', which cannot be said of *š'êr*. BUHL claims without explanation that

š'êr means 'inner flesh' as opposed to *bâšâr* 'outer flesh'; the latter is perhaps to be referred to a presumed euphemism (KÖHLER), questionable in Lv. xv 2, and quite unwarranted in Ez. xvi 26; xxiii 20. One may with as great justification suggest that in Ex. xxi 10 š'êr is 'flesh' in the sense of 'fleshly satisfaction', including also conjugal pleasure in a general well-being of the flesh. This is quite suited to the Septuagint *tâ déonta*.

K'sût means 'covering', and in series with 'food' it would suggest 'raiment'. But as applied to the indemnity-money of Gn. xx 6, KÖHLER quite plausibly finds the sense 'covering of eyes = declaration of undamaged womanly reputation'; this sense is still more prominent in the undisprovable Revised Version '*thy brother* is to thee a covering of eyes', i. e. a guardian of thy chastity. This undoubtedly metaphorical use would seem based on a literal *veil* or shawl rather than garment in general; in *Études sur le code de l'Alliance* (Paris 1946) 49, CAZELLES concludes from uses in Is. 1 3, the 400-year-stele of Tanis, and the Til-Barsib relief, to a sort of undergarment. The radical sense of the verb is of *protection* as well as covering, especially in Dt. xiii 9. It seems that the 'covering' Ex. xxi 10 may well have this sense of protection or 'harem-seclusion' (*harem* of its nature referring not to the plurality of wives but to the accommodation accorded them).

Ônâ occurs only here. In Modern Hebrew and Jewish Aramaic it is known with the sense of 'fixed time', but as relating to conjugal duty, and hence traceable directly to Ex. xxi 10 rather than to a far-fetched link with 'êt 'time' from the root 'answer'; more reasonable would be 'answer' in the sense of *verantwortlich*, 'her responsibility', as the Latin euphemistic *debitum*; or KÖHLER's suggested derivation from 'nh II 'cause to submit' or III 'disquiet'. Others prefer to work from 'wn 'dwell', yielding '(co-)habitation' as Latin *civis* = '(fellow-) citizen'. The crucial Hos. x 10 'ônâtâm (Ketib; Qere 'eynôtâm) could be the same form as Ex. xxi 10, 'their cohabitation', though one wonders how this can be supported by the 'an'ta of Os. ii 17 (CAZELLES), and most commentators prefer 'their iniquities'. In any case there is unanimity as to the sense of 'ônâ in Ex. xxi 10. And yet CAZELLES notes that it is incompatible with the verb *yigra* 'diminish' ('il paraît difficile qu'on oblige le maître à ne pas réduire ses relations avec une 'âmâh s'il en a une autre'). But instead of rendering *yigra* as 'suppress', one might rather supply from the context a more suitable meaning for the uncorroborated 'ônâ. In fact, as is well known from the stories of Rachel Gn. xxx 1, Anna 1 Sam. i 8, and

Ruth iii 9, the Hebrew woman valued above all the prize of parenthood, and surely would have preferred its safeguarding to that of sense-pleasure or companionship with a disaffected master; hence we may venture that the legislator is here referring to the 'marriage right' in the sense of 'the right of becoming a mother'.

Thus the enigmatic 'he shall not diminish her flesh, covering, and response' signifies without emendation 'he shall not curtail her physical satisfaction, her honorable standing in the harem, or her right of parenthood'.

Rome

ROBERT NORTH

A CASE OF FAULTY HARMONIZATION

The MT of Is. xxxvii 18 and its Greek translation have been considered, quite rightly, faulty renderings of the parallel passage in 2 Kings xix 17¹⁾. Both the Hebrew of Is. "אמנם יהוה החריבו מלכי" "אשור את כל הארצות ואת ארצם", and the Greek "ἔπ' ἀληθείας γὰρ ῥηήμωσαν βασιλεῖς Ἀσσυρίων τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην καὶ τὴν χῶραν αὐτῶν²⁾", "evidently purport to signify (that) the Assyrian kings destroyed all countries, as well as their own"³⁾. Now this has hardly been intended by the author of Is. Targ. Jonathan evades the issue by rendering the passage "וית ארעהון וית כל מדינתא- וית", i.e. "(they destroyed) all the capitals and their (surrounding) countries". In his wake follow the mediaeval Jewish exegetes, Rashi and Kimchi. Some mss. of MT insert here the 2 Kings reading "הגרים" which is accepted, without justification, in the *Biblia Hebraica*⁴⁾.

It is obvious that 2 Kings xix 17 has preserved a much better reading: "החריבו מלכי אשור את הגרים ואת ארצם". The author of Is. or some copyist who worked before the Greek translation was made, read הארצות instead of הגרים. This in itself is understandable, since those two nouns have similar connotations and serve sometimes as equivalents in cases of parallelismus membrorum⁵⁾. But it cannot

¹⁾ I. L. SEELIGMANN, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah*. 1948, pp. 59-60.

²⁾ יהוה has not been translated. This may point to an amalgamation of the abbreviated Tetragrammaton by haplography with the ה of החריבו. — vide VT IV, 1954, pp. 206-07.

³⁾ SEELIGMANN, *loc. cit.*

⁴⁾ This will be shown to be definitely a case of late improvement. The *lectio difficilior* "כל הארצות" is to be preferred.

⁵⁾ e.g. Hab. iii 12; Ps. ii 8.

be assumed that word-substitution took place in the present textual stage of the passages treated, since it would be much *too* obviously "thoughtless and incorrect" ¹⁾).

The solution of our problem is proffered by the Greek rendering of 2 Kings xix 17: ὅτι ἀληθεῖα, κύριε, ἡρῆμωσαν βασιλεῖς Ἀσσυρίων τὰ ἔθνη when considered in conjunction with the reading of DSIa: **הַחֲרִיבוּ מַלְכֵי אַשּׁוּר אֶת כּוֹל הָאָרְצוֹת** ²⁾). The present MT of Is. and 2 Kings, as well as the Greek translation of the passage in Is. are but expansions of originally shorter renderings which have been preserved in 2 Kings G and in DSIa. 2 Kings G translates actually an original Hebrew: **הַחֲרִיבוּ מַלְכֵי אַשּׁוּר אֶת הַגּוֹיִם**, which is a perfect and correct parallel to the DSIa text. If word-substitution has to be assumed—the present author for one is inclined to consider both the 2 Kings G and the DSIa readings as independent original wordings—it took place before the sentence was expanded. The Is. version became absurd when the clause "**וְאֵת אֲרָצֵם**" was carried over from 2 Kings, where it fits quite well, by an over-zealous scribe who intended to harmonize the two differing versions.

The process started apparently in 2 Kings. Some scribe or reader felt unhappy about the wording "**הַחֲרִיבוּ . . אֶת הַגּוֹיִם**" which seemed to him to be less comprehensive than the parallel "**כּוֹל הָאָרְצוֹת**". **הַגּוֹיִם** meant "peoples" only and did not indicate that their countries as well were devastated by the Assyrians. He therefore added "**וְאֵת אֲרָצֵם**". The clause was then inserted in Is. and taken over by the Greek translator.

This process of harmonization was carried on in inner-Greek developments. Origen had already before him the Hebrew Kings reading in its present form. On this authority, or perhaps on the authority of some Greek mss. at his disposal, he added ³⁾ "**καὶ τῇ νύκτι αὐτῶν**", with an asterisk to the original G translation. Lucian went one step further. He inserted **πᾶσαν** ⁴⁾ before **τῇ νύκτι αὐτῶν**, following his tendency to combine differing versions.

We may therefore discern four stages in the development of the passage treated here:

¹⁾ SEELIGMANN, *loc. cit.*

²⁾ This translator had a text before him in which the Tetragrammaton was yet fully written.

³⁾ Vide SEELIGMAN, *op. cit.*, p. 63; H. ORLINSKY, *JQR* N. S. 28, 1937.

⁴⁾ On account of the parallel passage in Is.

1. את כול הארצות — DSIa
 את הגוים — 2 Kings xix 17 G: ἀτ ἐθνῶν
2. את הגוים ואת ארצם — 2 Kings MT; G^h
3. את כל הארצות ואת ארצם — Is. xxxvii 18 MT; G
4. את כל הגוים ואת ארצם — 2 Kings G^{Luc}

“ואת ארצם” was inserted after the Greek translation of 2 Kings had been made ¹⁾. But it was already before the translator of Is. and before Origen. This seems to imply that, in the case treated, the Greek translation of Is. is later than that of Kings ²⁾.

Jerusalem (Isr.)

S. TALMON

THE UNIQUE CHARACTER OF BIBLICAL GREEK

Prof. H. S. GEHMAN in *V.T.* I, 2 and III, 2, stressed the Semitic character of Septuagint Greek, and from this he drew the conclusion that it was a language which was understood among the Jews, but was distinct in many ways from the main-stream of the *koiné*. Our own enquiries into the syntax of biblical Greek prompt us to offer further evidence in support of this position, and we have also noted something of the essential unity of this type of Greek with that of the New Testament.

Prof. GEHMAN brought forward a number of clear Hebraisms which point to the existence of a religious Greek. But there are several other syntactical features, not obviously Semitic, which seem to us to divide the Greek Old Testament, and parts at least of the New, quite distinctly from the Greek of the papyri. This is not the position which used to be adopted when the papyri were first investigated by such scholars as DEISSMANN and MOULTON, but neither is it to return to the theological assumptions implicit in a “Holy Ghost language.”

Some of these matters of syntax may seem to be only details, but they are straws in the wind.

- 1) No one appears to have studied closely the use of ἐκεῖνος in

¹⁾ Or else the translator based himself on a ms. which had yet the original wording.

²⁾ The evidence, though too scanty to be indicative, would not corroborate the conclusions arrived at by SEELIGMANN “that this translation of Kings belonged to the stratum of biblical translations, younger than the Septuagint of Isaiah”, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

the Septuagint. MAYSER ¹⁾ leaves us in no doubt as to its use in the Ptolemaic papyri. What interests the Septuagint student particularly is the use of this word a) independently, and b) attributively. Both usages of course were classical, but whereas the Old Testament translators employed an idiom almost exclusively composed of the one form, the ordinary language of Egypt had practically abandoned this form and adopted the other. MAYSER observes that one can read through whole volumes of papyri, which differ in their style of Greek, and never find either οὗτος or ἐκεῖνος employed attributively; the decrees of officials and semi-scholarly writing reveal the same kind of thing. Even as early as iii/BC, out of 15 examples of ἐκεῖνος in Zen. Pap. III and IV, thirteen are independent and only two attributive.

The position in the Old Testament is the very reverse. One learns with some surprise that the independent ἐκεῖνος is virtually dead.

	a) Independent	b) Attributive	Proportion
Minor Prophets	1	59	1 : 59
Judges	—	36	—
Early Kingdoms ²⁾	2	69	1 : 35
Chronicles	—	30	—
Jeremiah	1	30	1 : 30
Isaiah	2	56	1 : 28
Daniel LXX	—	28	—
1 Maccabees	2	56	1 : 28
2 Esdr.-Nehemiah	—	26	—
Late Kingdoms ²⁾	—	25	—
Pentateuch	8	159	1 : 20
Ezekiel	2	24	1 : 12
Daniel Th.	2	23	1 : 11.5
Joshua	2	22	1 : 11
Judith	2	11	1 : 5.5
Esther	—	3	—
1 Esdras	3	8	1 : 3
Job	3	8	1 : 3
Tobit S	2	5	1 : 2.5
Psalms	1	2	1 : 2
Eccles.	—	1	—
Tobit B	1	1	1 : 1
2-4 Maccabees	14	13	1 : 1
Proverbs	3	2	1 : 0.6
Wisdom	12	6	1 : 0.5
Sirach	1	—	—

The position compares very well with the New Testament Greek,

¹⁾ E. MAYSER, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, II, 2, 1934, pp. 79-82.

²⁾ THACKERAY's distinction. We have not similarly divided Ezekiel or Jeremiah.

except for St. John and St. Paul, who with the Book of Wisdom adopt the less Semitic and more normal Greek of the papyri in this respect.

	a) <i>Independent</i>	b) <i>Attributive</i>	<i>Proportion</i>
Matthew	4	50	1 : 12
Luke-Acts	6	50	1 : 8
Mark	5	18	1 : 4.5
Revelation	—	2	—
Heb.-Jas.-2 Pet.	6	6	1 : 1
Pastorals	4	3	1 : 0.75
Paul	9	4	1 : 0.5
John & 1 John	59	18	1 : 0.3

St. John doubtless had reasons for adopting an emphatic style. Apart from this, it is the writers who may be suspected of having Semitic sources of one kind or another who agree most closely with the majority of the Septuagint books in this matter. Thus they have a style differing markedly from that of the normal *koiné*.

2) Now let us test the position of ἐνεκα (-εν). The orthography of this word can easily be changed by the scribes of manuscripts, but not so easily the position. Nearly always in the LXX (and New Testament) this preposition occurs *before* its noun.

	<i>Before</i>	<i>After</i>	
Pentateuch	30	6	
Joshua	5	—	
Early Kms	6	—	
Late Kms	4	1	
1 Esdras	3	—	
Judith	—	1	
Sirach	2	1	
Psalms	29	—	
Proverbs	1	—	
Minor Prophets	17	2	
Ezekiel	8	—	
Isaiah	13	2	
Jeremiah	3	1	
Dan. LXX	3	—	
Dan. Th.	4	—	
2 Macc.	3	1	
3 Macc.	1	1	
Total	132	16	Ratio 8 : 1
Matthew	7	—	
Mark	4	—	
Luke-Acts	6	2	
Paul	6	—	
Total	23	2	Ratio 11 : 1

This is a distinct feature of style, in marked contrast to that of the Ptolemaic papyri and Polybius, where the tendency is twice as strong to reverse this position:

	<i>Before</i>	<i>After</i>
Ptolemaic papyri	15	35
Polybius	13	32

3) A third test, in which we have not been able to accomplish a quite complete investigation of the Septuagint, comprises the position of $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\zeta$ (sing. and plur.) in relation to its substantive. MAYSER¹⁾ has very thoroughly investigated the Ptolemaic papyri for the position of $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\zeta$, and he has disclosed four distinct "types" of position for $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\zeta$ in relation to its substantive. Thus, there is 1) $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\zeta$ ἄνθρωπος, 2a) $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\zeta$ ὁ ἄνθρωπος, 2b) ὁ ἄνθρωπος $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\zeta$, 3) ὁ $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\zeta$ ἄνθρωπος, and the plurals of these in each "type".

	<i>Type 1</i> s. pl.		<i>Type 2a</i> s. pl.		<i>Type 2b</i> s. pl.		<i>Type 3</i> s. pl.	
Papyrus iii/BC	17	2	14	40	18	56	22	5
Papyrus ii-i/BC	23	11	11	20	5	90	19	13
Pentateuch	439	55	337	588	3	4	9	—
Joshua	37	5	60	71	3	—	1	1
Judg.-Ruth	31	6	36	36	—	1	1	3
E. Kms	104	24	102	162	—	—	3	1
L. Kms	73	18	91	124	—	—	—	—
Chron.	132	34	86	143	1	3	8	6
1 Esdras	18	5	19	46	—	4	1	1
2 Esd.-Neh.	32	9	33	31	—	—	2	4
Tobit S	12	6	11	50	1	2	1	—
Tobit B	16	2	4	37	—	—	—	—
Judith	38	7	57	68	2	—	—	—
Sirach	112	10	11	24	—	2	—	—
Wisdom	11	2	2	1	—	3	1	—
Psalms	40	11	41	223	—	—	—	—
Proverbs	33	10	4	20	—	—	—	—
Job	31	2	3	16	—	2	—	1
Esther	26	1	10	28	—	1	—	2
Eccles.	20	2	9	12	—	—	2	—
Min. Proph.	20	9	36	110	—	—	—	—
Isaiah	67	9	26	75	1	6	—	1
Jer. α	38	4	35	73	—	—	1	—
Matthew-Mark	29	3	21	46	2	5	—	—

¹⁾ *Op. cit.*, II, 2, p. 102.

The results of this can be seen almost at a glance. The papyri have developed the hitherto emphatic form 2b at the expense of the form 2a which is so highly favoured in the Greek Old Testament. The result is even more striking, and a more useful comparison can be made, if the above figures are reduced to a percentage basis. Thus:

	Type 1		Type 2a		Type 2b		Type 3	
	s. pl.		s. pl.		s. pl.		s. pl.	
Pap. iii/BC	10	1	8	23	10	32	13	3
Pap. ii-i/BC	12	6	6	10	2	46	10	7
Pentateuch	30	5	24	40	2	.25	.6	—
Joshua	22	3	33	40	1	—	.5	.5
Judg.-Ruth	27	5	32	32	—	1	1	2
E. Kms	26	6	26	41	—	—	.75	.25
L. Kms	24	6	30	40	—	—	—	—
Chronicles	32	8	21	35	.25	.75	2	1
1 Esdras	19	6	20	47	—	5	1.5	1.5
2 Esd.-Neh.	29	8	30	28	—	—	2	4
Tobit S	14	8	13	60	1	3	1	—
Tobit B	27	4	6	63	—	—	—	—
Judith	22	4	33	40	1	—	—	—
Sirach	70	6	7	15	—	1	—	—
Wisdom	55	10	10	5	—	15	5	—
Psalms	13	3	13	70	—	—	—	—
Proverbs	49	15	6	30	—	—	—	—
Job	56	4	5	29	—	4	—	2
Esther	38	1	15	41	1	1	—	3
Eccles.	44	4	20	27	—	—	4	—
Min. Proph.	11	5	21	63	—	—	—	—
Isaiah	37	5	14	40	.5	3	—	.5
Jeremiah α	26	3	22	48	—	—	1	—
Matthew-Mark	27	3	20	43	2	5	—	—

A careful comparison of these figures will reveal an impressive homogeneity among the books of the Septuagint, with a few notable exceptions (Tobit S, Sirach, Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Eccl., 2 Esd.-Neh.). They have exactly the same tendencies as Matthew and Mark, and yet they differ profoundly from the papyri both of the iii/BC and ii-i/BC. *Wisdom* is a possible exception. There is little doubt that Semitic influence has much to do with this, especially the higher percentage of Type 1 in the singular in the biblical books, and their almost complete avoidance of the non-Semitic type 2b.

We cannot pretend to have done any more than scrape the surface of this syntactical field of investigation. It is highly probable that

other features of style, when thoroughly examined, will yield equally imposing results. It all goes to support the general impression of unity which is gained by the student of biblical Greek, whatever its period, and shows that this language is not as close to that of the papyri as was formerly suggested—even when the more obvious “Semitisms” have been eliminated.

Derby

NIGEL TURNER

REVIEWS

Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros edidit Ludwig KOEHLER (A Dictionary of the Hebrew Old Testament in English and German) & Walter BAUMGARTNER (A Dictionary of the Aramaic Parts of the Old Testament in English and German). Pp. lxvi & 1138. Leiden, E. J. Brill. 1953. Price Dutch fl. 67.50.

In the history of the study of any language or dialect the appearance of a new dictionary should be a landmark, and in the case of the present publication there are special reasons why this should be so. The intrinsic importance of the Hebrew Bible is appreciated now as never before by students in a number of disciplines. Its status as a corpus of primary documents for literary, historical, linguistic and religious study has been heightened rather than diminished by the archaeological and epigraphic discoveries of the last generation and by the comparative studies and new techniques that have been brought to bear upon it. At the same time this abundance of new material and methods has immeasurably complicated the task of the lexicographer of Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic. During this period of unprecedented activity no new full-scale dictionary of the Hebrew Bible has been produced, so that the present work had not the advantage of being able to draw upon any recent predecessor and involved a good deal of pioneering and the collection, co-ordination and assimilation of a vast amount of scattered and disparate evidence. In English the latest dictionary was the classic work of BROWN, DRIVER and BRIGGS, first published in 1891-1906 and available since 1952 in a corrected impression. In German Frants BUHL's revision of GESENIUS' *Handwörterbuch*, being the 17th edition, dates from 1915 and remains unchanged in the 1949 reprint. The later editions of KÖNIG's *Wörterbuch*, down to the 7th (1936), have undergone only minor revision and addition beyond the 2d edition, published in 1922. One other work should be mentioned, the *Lexicon Hebraicum et Aramaicum Veteris Testamenti* edited by F. ZORELL; publication began in 1940, eight years before the work under review began to appear, the Hebrew part was finished in 1954, not long after the completion of the present work, and a concluding fascicule, containing the Aramaic portion and a reverse index, is due to appear shortly.

Thus KÖHLER and BAUMGARTNER have undertaken to satisfy a long-standing and keenly felt need, and they or their publishers have set out to serve the German-reading and the English-reading public at one and the same time by giving all entries, except for references and Semitic, Greek and Latin words, in both German and English. This procedure is not without precedent, but the case is rather different from e.g. the single-word equivalents in English and German in the second edition of DALMAN's *Dialektproben*, and the differences in word-order as between English and German often produce awkward results. As to the satisfactoriness of the procedure the last word must rest not with the reviewer but on the one

hand with the publisher and on the other with the student who knows some Hebrew and either German or English but not both. From random enquiries among students the reviewer has the impression that beginners find the arrangement rather disconcerting, but this feeling ought to wear off with practice, and would be considerably mitigated if the English meanings, instead of being given in spaced italic — which is less familiar to British and American than to Continental readers and which in consequence they do not readily distinguish from the ordinary italic — could be set in a distinctive type. The publishers must have considered the possibility of issuing a German and an English edition simultaneously, and presumably they rejected it on grounds of cost. Most readers will regret this decision and it is surprising that it had to be so when, for example, the new edition of the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* — a much larger and more expensive work and one beyond the means of many individuals — can be brought out simultaneously in several European tongues. The two cases are admittedly not quite comparable in some respects, for the text of the *Encyclopaedia* is rarely broken by foreign type running in the reverse direction, and in the *Lexicon* the rubrics, references and Semitic and other citations constitute a good deal of common ground. But harshnesses and irritations are inevitable; to take but one example, the English-reading student is bound to have some difficulty in remembering that the three major prophets are Js, Ir and Hs. And this is a work intended primarily for students, else there would be no need for two European tongues. It ought therefore to be as cheap as possible, and while the price (£ 6 : 15 :— in publisher's binding) is not out of the way, it must be asked whether the saving to the publisher is such as to justify him in making the student buy a second set of translations and comments which he either cannot read, or else if he can, does not need.

Before leaving the matter of concurrent English and German explanations and translations the reviewer must record the fact that the idiom and accuracy of the English parts are not good enough; sometimes the German is necessary for the elucidation of the English. That K. should himself have shouldered the task of producing the English equivalents is no small tribute to his knowledge of the tongue, but the pitfalls of English language and style are such that without a native guide most would be bound sooner or later to come to grief. This shortcoming is the more to be regretted because it unnecessarily shakes the reader's confidence in other parts of the work. The Aramaic portion is exempt from this criticism, which of course in no way affects the German text. This weakness must be remedied in any future English or bilingual edition.

In one other respect the authors have sought to consult the preferences of learners rather than those of more experienced workers. As against the great majority of Semitic dictionaries, but in common with GESENIUS-BUHL and KÖNIG, they have adopted the alphabetic order not of roots but of words, regard being paid even to the *matres lectionis*. It may be acknowledged that this is a feature that students will appreciate. Whether it is in their own best interests is rather doubtful; many, and amongst them the present reviewer, consider it desirable to inculcate from the earliest possible

moment the habit of analysing forms and identifying radicals and roots, and this will be furthered if the student knows that until he can construe the word and strip the root of its 'accidentals' he cannot expect to find the word in his dictionary. Again, and this applies both to the learner and the more advanced student, the variety of words derived from any root and their range of meanings can best be studied if they are arranged together after their root. And the comparative evidence assembled under the root is relevant to the discussion of each of the derivatives and should be readily accessible for the study of whatever derivative is in question. If the reader will but compare the arrangement of, e.g., **כּוּן**, **יִרְשׁ**, **יִסַּד** and their derivatives in *BDB* and in *GB* or *KB* he will see how much more serviceable and satisfying the former is.

The Lexicon contains no reverse index such as is given by *GB* and *Kd*. Whether the reason is the same as that proffered by *BDB* (p. ix) we are not told. Separate German-Hebrew and English-Hebrew indices would have added materially to the size of the volume, and so far as the reviewer is aware the omission will not be felt to be a serious deprivation.

For its size the Lexicon forms a remarkably convenient and manageable single volume. The type is well-proportioned and in general very satisfactory, though there are more smudges and broken letters than one would like, and some of the vowel-signs and marks of punctuation show a nomadic tendency, e.g. the Arabic vowels are often too far to the left, *holem* sometimes appears over the right tip of the following consonant, the full stop is occasionally level with the top of the small letters, and the Ethiopic script in particular is none too accurate.

In accordance with modern practice the Aramaic vocabulary is dealt with separately. This part of the book, pp. 1045-1138, is the work of Professor Walter BAUMGARTNER of Basel. In some ways this was the more tractable part of the undertaking, since the vocabulary runs to no more than 700 words, including proper names. But the considerable developments in Aramaic research since 1915, of which B. gives a succinct and valuable account in this Introduction, have necessitated a complete review of every entry. Aramaic lexicography has by no means kept pace with the accumulation of new material. There has been no addition to the dictionaries of Aramaic dialects since the important 2d. edition of BROCKELMANN's *Lexicon Syriacum* in 1928 and CANTINEAU's *Le Nabatéen* II in 1932; the epigraphic glossaries of COOK (1898), LIDZBARSKI (1898) and COOKE (1903) have not been brought up to date; the Pehlevi Huzvarešh or ideograms are still without a systematic and exhaustive treatment, and for Mandaean, of which B. has been able to make fuller use than any of his predecessors, there is no published dictionary. B. is noted for his bibliographical completeness and his entries have full comparative data, including material from the Brooklyn and Borchardt papyri made available to him in advance of publication, and brief references to the leading discussions and definitive treatments. Nothing of consequence from Ugarit to Ma'lula and Ṭur 'Abdin appears to have escaped him, and his judgements are invariably sober. The words **מִשָּׁה** 'measure' (Ezr. vi 3) and **שִׁלָּה** 'insolence' (Da. iii 29) are adopted as part of the vocabulary of Biblical Aramaic. Corrections

and improvements, other than those noted by the author, are called for only occasionally; the reviewer has noted the following. — p. 1050b, last line, read ^{אֲוֹלָיִתְךָ}. — S.v. ^{אֲמָה}, read 'pl. of m. formation, as generally', and similarly p. 1076b, ll. 2-3. — S.v. ^{אֲסָר} read 'prohibition' and so s.v. ^{רָשָׁם}. — S.v. ^{בָּ}, read ^{שָׁלַט}. — S.v. ^{דְּבָרָה}, read 'official language'. — S.v. ^{הָדָם}, read 'dismembering as an Oriental mode of penal execution'. — S.v. ^{זֹרַע}, read 'Grfd. *dr', ^{זָר} kan.?' — S.v. ^{צַב} pa. read 'Var. ^{צִיבָא}'. — S.v. ^{כָּרִסָא} read. ^{כְּרִסִּי} — S.v. ^ל 9., after 'resemble' delete 'to'. — S.v. 13., for 'composed' read 'compound-ed'. — S.v. ^{לָא} ad fin., read 'unlimited'. — S.v. ^{לָהֶם}, for 'befit' read 'befit'. — S.v. ^{מָרָא}, read ^{מָרָא}; when written without 'alif al-waṣl' the word may have any of the three vowels after the *mim*. — S.v. ^נ read 'gemination' rather than 'duplication'. — S.v. ^{נִבְרָשָׁה}, read ^{נִבְרָשָׁה}. — S.v. ^{נָדַב}, 'spenden' is not 'spend' but 'offer, bestow, contribute'. — S.v. ^{קָדָם} 3., read 'for, on the part of'. — S.v. ^{שָׁן} read ^{שָׁן} — P. 1133b, last line, read ^{שַׁעְתָּא} (or. ^{שָׁ}). It will be observed that these and other trifles scarcely affect the substance of B.'s work, the importance of which can be summed up by saying that it is an indispensable tool and the natural starting-point for lexical study not only of Biblical Aramaic but also of the Imperial, Egyptian and later phases.

Ludwig KÖHLER, formerly professor of Old Testament in the University of Zürich, is responsible for the whole of the Hebrew portion, extending over 1043 pages and representing the fruits of a lifetime of Biblical study, teaching and research. The situation in regard to Hebrew is not quite the same for the modern lexicographer as it is in the case of Aramaic; for one thing the new Canaanite material is more disparate and its relationship is not so close as that, for example, of the Egyptian papyri to Biblical Aramaic. Some readers will regret that, while the Ugaritic and Phoenician documents have very properly been laid under contribution, the more closely related evidence from Palestine itself, including the Lachish letters and the Samaritan ostraca, has not been systematically adduced. It is of course notoriously difficult in a task extending over a long period of time and dealing with a large and heterogeneous mass of material to establish a firm and satisfactory code of procedure and to adhere to it throughout without modifying it in some vital respect as a result of experience, and K. would probably be the first to admit that his treatment of words has not been completely even and consistent. He appears to attach rather less importance to bibliographical indications than does B., and consequently references are sometimes omitted and sometimes inserted, and those given are not always the most apt. Thus in the case of personal names the meaning and/or a reference to NORTH or to some other source is sometimes given and sometimes not; in the case of place-names the location or modern site-name is given where possible — indeed this is one of the most satisfactory features of the

work — but the meaning only rarely, and there is no evidence that BORÉE has been used. To give another and more specific illustration, we may apply the test of evenness, consistency and clarity of treatment to the entries for the names of the Hebrew months. Here a mere transliteration is insufficient and perhaps unnecessary. What the reader looks for is an indication of (a) the origin and signification of the month-name and (b) the position of the month in the calendar, in order that in any given context he may understand what time of year is referred to and what the name used might connote to the Hebrew writer or reader. Thus in the case of the first month (by the spring reckoning) the immediate source of the name **נִסָּן** is given, it is explained as *first month = March-April*, and a cross-reference to **אֲבִיב** is given. This is all very proper. But the reader who has to look up the alternative name **אֲבִיב** learns only that it means *month of the ears*, and unless he happens already to know something about agricultural conditions in Palestine he can only guess what time of year would be so named. Nor does he learn that the name is a Canaanite one which was later supplanted by the Accadian; the abbreviation 'kan.' should be inserted before 'Name' and also in the entries for the other three Canaanite month-names. Again **אֱלוֹל** is simply *name of a month*. **אֵיתָנִים** and **כֶּסֶּלֹו** are identified with October and December respectively, while the two months that follow them are placed respectively in October-November and December-January. **שֶׁבַט** as well as **אֲדָר** is equated with February-March. And is **אֵיתָנִים** really the '*month in which only the everflowing rivers have water left*' and not rather the time when steady rains resume and all the water-courses run continuously?

But if in irregularities of this sort K. shows the defects of his qualities, the qualities themselves have left their imprint, and in many of the entries the reader is stimulated by the products of an original and independent mind. As an example we may cite the entry on the letter *waw* and the use of the conjunction 'and' which contains some new suggestions. However, while K. realises that the boundary between consonant and vowel is not in practice so rigid as it is sometimes made to appear, and while, for example, relative sonority is an important phonological factor, it is going rather far to describe *waw* categorically as a semi-vowel. Nor is the suggestion that the final *waw* in such forms as **אֲבִי** is a vowel a happy one; *'ābīw* develops, with the loss of inter-vocalic *b*, into *'ābīw* or *'ābīu*, with a final glide, and not into *'ābīū*, which form is contrary to all analogy and is opposed by the traditional vocalisation (cf. *JRAS* 1941, 31 ff.). The illustration adduced from Sa'idic Coptic is not germane to a lexicographical study of the Hebrew form. The phrase 'ב etc.' towards the foot of p. 244a is not precise enough, and on p. 244b the statement under b) should read 'with the exception of ה, ח and י', and the imperative singular of **חָיָה** should be listed under d). *Waw* consecutive with the imperfect is separately dealt with under the rubric ***וְ**, but without elucidation of the history of the form

thus posited. K. might usefully have referred to his remarks in *BZAW* XXXVII (1923), 73, which may now be supplemented by MAAG's note in *ZAW* LXVIII (1953), 96-8. Recent tablets from Ras Shamra afford instances of a deictic or demonstrative element *b n* (cf. VIROLLEAUD in *CRAIBL* 1952, 231 and n. 2 and *Syria* XXX (1953), 187, n. 2) and suggest that the deictic element *han* is to be associated with the definite article. Incidentally K. gives *han-* as the ground-form of the article, referring to

Arabic *هَـ* (*sic*, not *هَـ*) as dealt with by NÖLDEKE, *NB.* 119.

However to select items at random for discussion is a rather haphazard procedure and may give the impression of unfairness. At the same time it is impossible within the limits of a review to deal fully with all that deserves comment. And so we propose in what follows to take K. very nearly at his word. In his preface (pp. ix, xv) K. remarks that the critic cannot arrive at a proper criterion by which to judge the work until he has himself prepared a dozen pages for the press. In this case the old challenge of the executant to the critic seems a fair one, and while it is not possible in a review to take it up in its literal form, it is useful to run over a dozen pages with a view to revision, and for this purpose the middle twelve pages of the Hebrew section, pp. 516-527 have been selected. The results of this survey are given in alphabetical order, as in the *Lexicon*; misprints and mis-translations are for the most part disregarded, and positive features are included in the comments. —

P. 516, l. 1, 'und *and*'; elsewhere generally abbreviated to 'u. *a.*'; why not use ampersand throughout? The few ideograms that remain in use in Europe are ideal for this sort of job.

מִן — The statistics regarding frequency and distribution of occurrences are a useful feature of K.'s work; in this instance his total of 247 occurrences, including two conjectural restorations (Ez. xxx 18 and Nah. i 13) and excluding one corrupt example (Is. ix 3), agrees with FÜRST (248t.) against MANDELKERN (246t.) and *BDB* (251t.). The other conjectural restorations listed later in the article, Mi. vi 9, Ez. vii 11, xix 14 involve modifications only of the Massoretic spelling of the word itself. The intent of the signs 'l' and 'cj' might, in the interests of textual criticism, be made clearer. Sometimes it would seem that the former is used to indicate the word to be read in lieu of a rejected instance of the word under discussion while the latter is used to introduce a restoration of a form of the word in question in place of some other reading. At other times K. appears to distinguish between conjectures which he is prepared to endorse ('l[ege]') and those to which he is not prepared to commit himself but which, apparently, he regards as deserving of mention ('cj' = 'conjectura', with or — more often — without the name of the author). In this an element of subjectivity is inevitable, but on the whole that is preferable to a regular and uncritical appeal to the pronouncements of the various editors of the third edition of KITTEL's *Biblia Hebraica*. The reviewer considers that as our knowledge increases it becomes increasingly evident that there is more room for the better interpretation of difficult words and phrases than for the amendment of corrupt readings. He would therefore tend to greater conservatism

in textual matters than K., and he is not convinced that in general any good purpose is served by recording in a dictionary any conjectures other than those approved and adopted. Thus in the present entry he doubts whether we know enough about classical Hebrew to be able to assert that in Is. ix 3 *maṭṭēb* must be altered to *mōṭat* and that in Ez. xxx 18 *maṭṭōt* must be read for *mōṭōt*, for the words to some extent overlap in meaning, and in neither case is the context decisive. This is not a criticism of K., who is prudently non-committal in regard to the latter instance, but it raises the question of the lexical status of a word not adopted outright as the correct reading. — The semantic development 'staff' > 'tribe', which is apt to perplex the student, deserves a brief elucidation, with a reference to something more recent than what S. R. DRIVER wrote in 1882, and it might be worth noting that the word is used only of the Israelite tribes.

מטה The rendering of Ezr. ix 13 is none too clear, and s.v. **הַשֵּׁף** K. follows BH³ in emending; the sense is 'forbear, spare (by dealing) short of . . .'.

***מטיל** The equation with μέταλλον is highly improbable, and the English meaning is more precise than the German.

מטמון There is no connection with μαμωνᾶς < **מָמוֹן** from the root *m w n*; cf. *Arch. Ling.* IV (1952), 60 ff.

מטע In Is. lx 21 and perhaps elsewhere this is an abstract rather than a noun of place.

מי Sub 1. In Ex. x 8 render 'who precisely, who all?' There is an inconsistency in the following lines in the insertion and omission of continuing dots. Sub 4. delete the second 'I' in the phrase for Ex. iii 11. Sub 5. **τίς** > **τις** — better > (**שׁ**)**טִים**; read **לִיהוּה**, and for 'cause' 'case' would be less ambiguous.

מִיכָל This word should be astericised. K. adopts one of the emendations noted in BH³, the *holem* being misplaced, but is it plausible to suppose a corruption of so simple a reading? The woman's answer is deliberately misleading and ambiguous; the scouts do not suspect that there is a **מִיכָל** in the courtyard and so they go to search elsewhere in vain. **מִיכָל** must then be some quite general term for a place or installation for the storage of water and a derivative of **כּוּל** or **יכּל** 'hold, contain'.

מין The sense of the root *m w n*, *m y n* is 'split', whence (a) 'divide, plough' and (b) 'dissemble, act with duplicity, lie, counterfeit'. The latter development is evident in **תְּמִינוּה**, and the ground sense can be seen in the various uses of **מִין**. — **מִינֵהוּ** is a plural with the suffix, and some of the apparent singulars require to be repointed as plurals in the Biblical text; cf. *JRAS* 1941, 34 n. 7. The later semantic development, on which see *JQR* XXXVIII (1947), 152-3, has no direct bearing on the Biblical use of the word.

מִינָקָה Add ug. *m š n q t*.

מיסך The later Jewish tradition is not of much assistance in regard to

details of cult and temple of which no continuous tradition persisted down to the Second Temple. The LXX does not point inevitably to the emendation accepted by K. from BH³, and if we may suppose that the LXX is better informed then what is referred to is a broad stone bench or divan for reclining upon, and מוסד in that case is from נסד in the sense of 'found, instal', the two Biblical instances of which are otherwise disposed of by K. s.v.

מִיפַעַת From *wp* 'be conspicuous'; cf. asa. and ar. n. loc. *myf* 't, *Mayfa* 'ab.

מִיץ For 'suckle' read 'suck'.

מִישָׁאֵל MONTGOMERY's etymology is more adventurous than NOTH's, for which there are parallels in BH and elsewhere. To the question put by the name 'Who is God's?' the child itself is the answer; cf. נְתַנָּאֵל and the names compounded from נָתַן and the like.

מִיתָר Read מִי־לָר.

מִכְאוֹב The emendation in Ps. xli 4 introduced from BH³ is a dubious improvement.

מִכְבָּנִי The second *patah* has dropped out.

מִכְבֵּר 'Cover?' — rather 'coverlet?'

מִכָּה If the forms in Dt. xxviii 59 and Jer. xlix 17 are regarded as needing correction (yet cf. GK² § 91n) the consonantal text should be left unchanged with *scriptio defectiva*; cf. Jer. xix 8.

מִכּוּרָה Supply *patah* below the *taw* of מְכֻרָה.

מִכָּךְ Apart from two certain instances of this verb there is one which K. eliminates (Ps. cvi 43) and there are two where he conjectures a form of this verb (Ps. lxxxviii 16 and lxix 11; the latter form must be pointed וְאִמְכָּה); these changes are not taken from BH³. That in Ps. lxxxviii 16 is the most plausible of the three, being supported by the LXX and Pešitta; one would expect further changes to be noted s. vv. נִשָּׂא and פָּגַע.

מִכְלָל Insert *patah* in the construct form.

מִכְלַת *Patah* has been dropped.

מִכְמַרְתָּ and מִכְמַרְתָּ should be separated, for they are not necessarily alternative forms of the same word. Similarly מִכְמַר and מִכְמַר pl., though each a *hapax legomenon*, may well be different words.

מִכְנָבִי Here the reviewer, as against K., would unhesitatingly mark the reading as a corruption, perhaps from (נְדָבִיָּה ?) וּמִבְנֵי or the like.

מִכְנָס The singular is not found and should be marked accordingly.

מָכַס Should the Armenian derivative be included?

מָכַסָּה It is rather hazardous to reprint Ez. xxvii 7 against the tradition of the vocalisers, and K. s.v. **מָכַסָּה** does not question the received form; Gen. viii 13, cited by BEWER in BH³, does not support the alteration, for there some sort of hatches or shutters is intended; cf. LXX ad locc.

מָכַסָּה Ez. xxvii 7 not 'deck' but 'awning'.

מָכַר In 1 Sam. xxiii 7 instead of emending it is preferable, on the principle of *difficilior lectio potior* to retain the MT and to render as 'discriminate against, repudiate, disown, remove' as in later Hebrew; cf. GUR: *Millon 'Ibri* s.v.; DE BOER, *O.T.S.* VI, 46: hostile.

***מִכְרָה** In the case of words entered as 'unexplained' it would be as well to add a reference to the most complete or reliable discussion of the word.

מָכַת The wisdom of singling out one of the occurrences for special notice with the sign *F* is open to question, especially as it is done only very occasionally.

מָלַא In the Qal the distinction between the transitive (מָלַא) and the intransitive (מָלַי) is fundamental and should be maintained throughout the discussion.

מָלַא Cf. ad **מָכַת** supra.

מָלַךְ This word exemplifies the inconvenience of separating roots and derivatives; ***לָאךְ** appears alone in its alphabetical position (where read לָאֵךְ), yet the only derivatives found are those on this and the following pages. P. 527b indicates another of the disadvantages of the alphabetic arrangement that has been adopted, in that various substantives from the simple form of the root *m l'* are separated from each other according as they have or lack the secondary feature of vowel letters.

As already stated these remarks are by no means all in criticism of K., and they show the extent to which Hebrew lexicography falls short of finality and leaves room for legitimate doubt and justifiable difference of opinion. The accession of new material increases the lexicographer's task, and often without correspondingly facilitating his decisions. The reviewer must record his admiration of the industry that K. has displayed in carrying through this formidable task and the stimulus that he has derived from surveying the results.

It is in the character of a landmark that it points the way to what lies beyond the horizon, and K.'s and B.'s work helps to indicate some of the outstanding tasks of Biblical scholarship, the achievement of which will greatly facilitate the task of their successors. Some of these have already been indicated, and others might be mentioned. One of them is the serious gap in the exegete's equipment caused by the lack of any modern and ade-

quate dictionary of the Septuagint, for the 1925-40 revision of LIDDELL and SCOTT deals only incidentally with the Septuagint and the vast amount of papyrological and Rabbinical material requires to be laid under specific contribution. Again the reviewer has become increasingly aware of the dangers which KITTEL's *Biblia Hebraica*, in spite of its many merits, may constitute for the incautious user, for the *apparatus criticus* is not always as careful or systematic as it should be, interpretation and translation must be very carefully distinguished and the emendations mentioned in the footnotes are often regarded as quasi-canonical. In short it is not too soon to project a new edition of this excellent work, incorporating all available new knowledge about the text and versions. The suggestion has repeatedly been made that a forum for textual emendations could be a very useful feature in an Old Testament journal. It is unlikely that at this date such a suggestion is likely to be adopted, for it would in effect be a standing invitation for all manner of neat but light-hearted proposals and it is gradually being realised that what the Hebrew Bible needs is not more but less emendation. But something of the sort in the lexical and linguistic field would serve a very useful purpose and would materially lighten the task of the future lexicographer of the Old Testament. If some journal were to undertake to make a periodic survey of the whole Semitic and related fields and to record briefly in alphabetic form all new discoveries in the matter of vocabulary, with special reference to the Hebrew Bible, its readers would have a useful and cumulative adjunct to their dictionaries, which would thus be kept regularly up to date. Not all students of the Old Testament have access to the general Semitic periodical literature, and only a minority are equipped to assess it, but its importance is generally recognised, and the Biblical student feels that in a rapidly developing branch of study he must be as nearly up to date as possible. Will not one of our journals consider whether it can undertake to provide this service?

University of St. Andrews, Scotland.

A. M. HONEYMAN

BOOK LIST ¹⁾

Festschrift A. Alt zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet (Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig. Gesellschafts- und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe 3. Jahrgang 1953/54). 178 pp. From the Contents: E. LAUCH: Etwas vom Codex Sinaiticus; H. BARDTKE: Der Traktat der Schreiber (Sopherim); S. HERRMANN: Die Königsnovelle in Ägypten und in Israel; R. MEYER: die Bedeutung der linearen Vokalisation für die hebräische Sprachgeschichte; J. HERZ: Formgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Problem des Hiobbuches; A. JEPSEN: Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Vätergestalten; H. DONNER: Zur Formgeschichte der Ahiram-Inschrift; W. HERRMANN: Zu Kohelet 3.14; A. ALT: Das literarische Werk.

¹⁾ The mention of books in this list neither implies nor precludes subsequent review at length.

- Teologisk Tidskrift*, Helsinki 1955, lx 1, In memoriam A. F. Puukko (1875-1954), A. LAUHA. A.O.: A. MURTONEN, Myöhäisjuntalaisesta raamatunselityksestä; G. VON RAD, Kuvakiello Vanhassa Testamentissa; H. RINGGREN, Siloasvatten; A. SALONEN, Kanaanilaisista profeetoista; I. SOISALON-SOININEN, Uusi Septuaginta-löytö.
- The Septuagint Bible*, translation of Ch. THOMSON, 1774-1789, ed. revised and enlarged by C. A. MUSES. 1426 pp., Indian Hills, Colorado 1954 (Falcon's Wing Press) Price \$ 6.50.
- The Interpreter's Bible*, Volume 4, Psalms and Proverbs, Abingdon Press, New York, Nashville. ix + 957 pp. Price \$ 8.75.
- This Volume includes an Introduction to the Book of Psalms (W. St. McCULLOUGH); Exegesis Psalms i-lxxi, xciii, xcv-xcvi, c, cxx-cxxxviii, cxl-cl (W. R. TAYLOR); Psalms lxxii-xcii, xciv, xcvi-xcix, ci-cxix, cxxxix (W. St. McCULLOUGH); Introduction and Exegesis of the Book of Proverbs (CH. T. FRITSCH).
- Judaism, Postbiblical and Talmudic Period*. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by Salomo W. BARON and Joseph E. BLAU, New York, Liberal Arts Press, 1954. xxvi + 245 pp. Price: \$ 1.75.
- Lebanese Proverbs, Modern*. Collected at Ras-al-Matn, Lebanon. 2 Vols. Collated, Annotated and Translated into English by Anis FRAYHA. American Univ. of Beirut, Oriental Series, Nos 25 and 26. Med. 8vo. sewn, xx + 748 pp. Beirut. Price Lib. £ 20.—.
- A. BENTZEN †, *King and Messiah*, Lutterworth Press, London, 1955. 112 pp. Price 10 s. 6 d.
- A revised edition of *Messias-Moses redivivus-Menschensohn* (Zürich 1951). The text has been slightly modified and expanded; and the references to literature have been considerably expanded and brought up to date.
- J. BONSRIVEN, *Textes rabbiniques des deux premiers siècles chrétiens*, pour servir à l'intelligence du Nouveau Testament. Roma, 1955 8vo. xii + 804 pp. Prix: Lire ital. 4.500; \$ 7.50.
- A. BRUNO, *Die Bücher Samuel*, eine rhythmische Untersuchung, 304 pp.; *Die Bücher Könige*, eine rhythmische Untersuchung, 298 pp. Stockholm, 1955. Price each Swed. Kr. 25.—.
- Zc'ev BEN-HAYYIM, *Studies in the Traditions of the Hebrew Language*, Instituto „Arias Montano", Madrid-Barcelona, 1954. 150 pp.
1. The form of the pronominal suffixes -ká, -há, and the affirmative -tá;
 2. Some observations on the pronunciation of Hebrew according to the Dead Sea Scrolls;
 3. The importance of the Samaritan tradition to the history of Hebrew and Aramaic.
- LUC. H. GROLLENBERG, *Atlas de la Bible*, Elsevier, Paris-Bruxelles, 1955. 35 cartes et 408 reproductions, avec préface de R. de VAUX. Traduit et adapté du néerlandais par R. BEAUPÈRE.
- J. L. KOOLE, *Het probleem van de canonisatie van het Oude Testament*, 29 pp., J. H. Kok, Kampen, 1955, Dutch Fl. 1.25.
- M. NOTH, *Histoire d'Israël*, édition française, revue par l'auteur, cartes, 8vo. cloth. p. 472 pp. Paris. Prix Fr. 1700.
- A. PARROT, *Le temple de Jérusalem*, 94 pp. Cahiers d'Archéologie biblique No. 5. Avec nombreux dessins, photographies et bonne bibliographie.
- K.-D. SCHUNCK, *Die Quellen des I. und II. Makkabäerbuches*, 135 pp., Niemeyer, Halle, (Saale), 1954. D.M. 8,30.

„VIVE LE ROI!”

PAR

P. A. H. DE BOER

Leiden

L'acclamation **יְהִי הַמֶּלֶךְ** ne se rencontre que de rares fois dans l'Ancien Testament. Après que le sort eut désigné Saül comme roi, Samuel déclare en montrant l'élus, qui les dépassait tous de la tête: „Voyez-vous celui que l'Éternel a choisi? Il n'y a personne dans tout le peuple qui soit semblable à lui.” Et tout le peuple poussa le cri: Vive le roi! (1 Sam. x 24).

Lorsqu' Absalom se fut nommé lui-même roi, Huschaï l'Arkien se déclare de son parti en s'écriant: Vive le roi! Vive le roi! (2 Sam. xvi 16). Lors de la fin du règne de David, un autre de ses fils, Adonijah disait: C'est moi qui serai roi. Il fit un sacrifice, y invita tous les fils du roi, les chefs de l'armée, et le prêtre Abiathar. Ils mangent et boivent devant lui — alors viennent les mots caractéristiques — tous disent: Vive le roi Adonijah! (1 Rois i 25). David réagit immédiatement après l'intervention de Nathan et de Bath-Schéba. Le prêtre Tsadok et le prophète Nathan sont convoqués pour oindre comme roi sur Israël Salomon, fils de Bath-Schéba. Il leur est dit: Vous sonnerez de la trompette, et vous direz: Vive le roi Salomon! (*ibidem* verset 34). Là-dessus, ils firent monter Salomon sur la mule du roi David, et le menèrent à Guihon. Le prêtre Tsadok prit la corne d'huile dans la tente, et il oignit Salomon. On sonna de la trompette, et tout le peuple cria: Vive le roi Salomon! (*ibidem* vv. 38 s.).

Nous lisons semblablement dans le passage du livre des Rois, où nous est rapporté l'élection de Joas, fils d'Achazia: Ils l'établirent roi et l'oignirent, et, frappant des mains, dirent: Vive le roi! (2 Rois xi 12, cf. 2 Chron. xxiii 11).

Ceci constitue le relevé complet des textes où se lisent les mots **יְהִי הַמֶּלֶךְ**. On peut y ajouter quelques formules employées à l'adresse du roi. Ainsi dans Néhémie ii 3, Néhémie lui-même commence sa réponse au roi qui lui a demandé: Pourquoi as-tu mauvais visage?

par les mots: Le roi vit éternellement. On notera que le mode employé est l'indicatif: **המלך לעולם חיה**.

De même Bath-Schéba dit à David, après que celui-ci lui ait promis par le serment „L'Éternel est vivant” — **חיה יהוה** —, que Salomon, son fils, lui succédera sur le trône, Vive à jamais mon seigneur le roi David! **יחי אדני המלך דוד לעולם** (1 Rois i 31). Dans la partie araméenne du livre de Daniel, nous constatons la même formule, à la cour de Nebucadnetsar, de Belschatsar et de Darius: O roi vis éternellement! **מלכא לעלמין חיי** (Dan. ii 4; iii 9; v 10; vi 7. 22). On relèvera aussi à ce propos les mots de Darius après le miracle de la préservation de Daniel dans la fosse aux lions: Il est le Dieu vivant et il subsiste éternellement, **אלהא חיא וקים לעלמין** (Dan. vi 27).

Bien qu'il existe une distinction entre l'acclamation Vive le roi et la formule de l'étiquette de cour, Que le roi mon seigneur vive à jamais, ces deux expressions ne peuvent se comprendre séparément l'une de l'autre. On observera cependant que l'expression **לעולם** à jamais, connote dans l'Ancien Testament et dans les textes extra-bibliques où on la rencontre une longue durée de vie¹). Il n'est en aucun sens question d'une vie éternelle. Les deux expressions sont adressées au roi à des moments importants comme l'accession au trône ou au cours de débats d'une importance décisive.

Il est manifeste qu'une juste détermination du sens du verbe „vivre”, **חיה**, est indispensable à la compréhension de ces deux expressions. Les conclusions auxquelles BAUDISSIN aboutit dans son travail richement documenté, intitulé „Adonis und Esmun”²), n'ont été que confirmées par les progrès de la recherche scientifique. En fait **חיה** signifie: être rempli de vitalité. M. JOHNSON, un des derniers auteurs qui se soient occupés de cette question, met l'accent sur la signification: revivre, au sens d'un recouvrement de la pleine santé, „a full and prosperous life”³). Il en fait ainsi à peu près l'équivalent du terme **יצלה** dans l'araméen du Targum.

Je suis porté néanmoins à croire que lorsque cet auteur fait des mots **יחי המלך** une sorte de toast à la santé du roi, „our toasting the king's health”, il ne rejoint pas tout le sens de cette expression. Mon sentiment est qu'il convient d'attacher une grande importance

¹) Cf. E. JENNI, *Das Wort 'olām im Alten Testament*, Berlin 1953.

²) W. W. v. BAUDISSIN, *Adonis und Esmun*, Part III „Jahwe der lebendige Gott”, Leipzig 1911, p. 450-527.

³) A. R. JOHNSON, *The Vitality of the Individual in the thought of Ancient Israel*, Cardiff 1949, p. 95s.

au fait qu'elle s'emploie à des moments décisifs¹⁾. Le contexte réclame davantage qu'un simple souhait de santé. Notons tout d'abord que le choix du roi est le fait de Jhwh. Ce n'est pas proprement une élection populaire. Le peuple accepte seulement celui qui se manifeste en puissance royale. Lorsque le mot est appliqué au peuple lui-même, nous devons le comprendre au sens de „prendre parti pour”. Le peuple ne peut pas destituer le roi une fois élu. Samuel déclare au peuple, lorsqu'il définit le droit du roi: „Alors vous crierez contre votre roi que vous vous serez choisi, mais l'Éternel ne vous exaucera point”²⁾.

Dans la scène fameuse où l'Israël du Nord déclare à Roboham: „Nous n'avons aucune part avec David et pas d'héritage avec le fils d'Isaï; à tes tentes, Israël! Veille à ta maison, David!” (1 Rois xii 16), s'exprime une vieille résistance à une royauté héréditaire tendant à remplacer la royauté charismatique. On remarquera aussi l'intervention déterminante de Jeroboam; aussitôt après la séparation, il accède à une royauté reconnue sans difficulté. Les changements de souverains ne sont jamais en Israël imputables à des mouvements populaires mais à des révolutions de palais ou des révoltes de l'armée où le prétendant au trône tient le rôle principal. Lorsque David est contraint de fuir devant Absalom, Simeï le maudit en lui disant: „Jhwh donne la royauté à votre fils Absalom”.

Le choix de Jhwh est exprimé au moyen d'une onction administrée par un prophète ou un prêtre. L'onction est le signe d'une vivification. On oigne d'huile les objets et les personnes qui doivent manifester la puissance divine.

Dans la vie courante, l'huile constitue un produit de première nécessité³⁾. Celui qui est en deuil ne s'oingt pas⁴⁾ mais bien celui qui reçoit de nouvelles forces pour s'avancer dans la vie⁵⁾. Ceux que l'Éternel a choisis sont oints d'une onction sainte en vue de l'accom-

¹⁾ Cf. R. PATAI, “Hebrew Installation Rites”, *HUCA* XX, 1947, p. 143 ss. PATAI parle d'un caractère rituel, nullement spontané; c'est une simple exécution des instructions de David (1 Rois i).

²⁾ L'insistance de J. DE FRAINE, *L'aspect religieux de la royauté israélite*, Rome 1954, sur „les droits du peuple” et „la ratification par le peuple” paraît méconnaître cet aspect des conceptions israélites. Elle pourrait mener à une idée fautive; Israël n'a jamais été une démocratie.

³⁾ Comparer dans l'accadien *še-ba ià-ba sig-ba || ep-ra pišša-tam lu-bu-uš-ta*, Ana ittišu, 3 III 48s.

⁴⁾ Voir aussi Gilgameš XII, 1re col. l. 16.

⁵⁾ Voir aussi Keret I 156.

plissement de leur mission. Cette onction en fait des êtres sacrés ¹⁾. Finalement, la trompette retentit et les applaudissements éclatent. Manifestations de joie qu'on ne voit qu'en de grandes occasions ²⁾.

Une autre raison encore amène à penser que l'acclamation Vive le roi! n'est pas équivalente à un simple souhait pour la bonne santé du roi. La racine חיה en liaison avec le roi se rencontre aussi dans la formule du serment: L'Éternel est vivant et le roi mon seigneur est vivant! חִי יְהוָה וְחִי אֲדֹנִי הַמֶּלֶךְ (2 Sam. xv 21) ³⁾. Ce ne sont que des personnages d'une exceptionnelle importance dont il est parlé de cette manière, soit des êtres divins: ainsi Jhwh, Elohim, El, le Taureau divin (Am. viii 14), le Pharaon, Eli, le prêtre de Silo, le roi, le prince Jonathan, Elie et Elisée, prophètes.

M. PEDERSEN a soutenu la thèse que le mot חִי ou חַי dans ces manières de serment est une forme d'état construit du substantif qui signifie la vie ⁴⁾. Son meilleur argument se trouve en 2 Sam. xi 11, חִיָּה וְחַי נִפְשָׁךְ, mots qui sont habituellement traduits: aussi vrai que tu es vivant et que ton âme est vivante. Le terme חִיָּה est incontestablement un substantif. Par contre, dans tous les autres textes, la position de M. PEDERSEN est difficilement défendable. Un passage de *hayyē* à *hē* ne saurait être admis sans difficulté. Pourquoi emploierait-on, auprès du nom divin, un singulier? Que dire alors de la forme חַי אֵל, Job xxvii 2, חַי הָאֱלֹהִים, 2 Sam. ii 27, et des mots חִי אֲנִי, חַי אֲנִכִּי, fréquemment attestés? Il paraît plus vraisemblable que le mot est à concevoir comme un adjectif. La vocalisation *hayyē* devant tout nom divin, alors que conformément aux lois de la vocalisation ⁵⁾, elle ne devrait se trouver que devant Jhwh, s'explique par des considérations théologiques ⁶⁾. Les targumim montrent la justesse de cette explication par le fait qu'ils remplacent régulièrement le mot חַי en corrélation avec le nom divin par celui de קַיִם ⁷⁾.

¹⁾ Cf. 1 Sam. xxiv, xxvi.

²⁾ Cf. 2 Rois xi 14; Esaïe lv 12.

³⁾ Cf. Gen. xlii 15s.; 1 Sam. i 26; xvii 55; 2 Sam. xiv 19; 1 Sam. xx 3; xxv 26; 2 Sam. xi 11; 2 Rois ii 2.4.6, iv 30; Am. viii 14; Dan. xii 7. En Egypte on jurait aussi par la vie (sans doute la puissance) du roi.

⁴⁾ Johs PEDERSEN, *Der Eid bei den Semiten*, Strassburg 1914, p. 15 ss.

⁵⁾ Cf. BAUER und LEANDER, *Historische Grammatik*, Halle a. Saale 1918, § 17w note p. 204. Voir aussi § 71w et 61z. Anm.

⁶⁾ Cf. H. GUNKEL, *Genesis*, 3^{me} éd., 1910, p. 444. Le seul passage qui diverge apparemment de cet usage est Dan. xii 7, où l'on lit בְּחַי הָעוֹלָם. La construction

est cependant légèrement différente.

⁷⁾ Cf. aussi Dan. vi 27, déjà cité. En outre TgJon. Gen. xxiv 62 et xxv 11.

M. PEDERSEN semble toutefois avoir très justement observé que les salutations à l'adresse du roi ne sont pas proprement des souhaits, rien plutôt des hommages ¹⁾. La formule de malédiction כה יעשה (ou וכה יוסי) emploie l'indicatif יעשה. On exprime ainsi manifestement que Dieu agira de telle manière. Ce n'est pas proprement souhaiter mais constater.

Dans les lettres de Lakiš, où toutes les diphtongues sont écrites, nous rencontrons aussi la formule חי יהוה ²⁾. On y trouve également en ii, iii, iv, v, (vi), vii, viii, ix) la formule connue des lettres araméennes que l'on traduit couramment par le souhait: que Jhwh fasse entendre à mon maître de bonnes nouvelles. On la trouve sous une forme développée dans un papyrus de la collection COWLEY: The health of your lordship may the God of Heaven seek after exceedingly at all times, and give you favour before Darius the king and the princes of the palace more than now a thousand times, and may he grant you long life, and may you be happy and prosperous at all times (*Aramaic Papyri*, No. 30) ³⁾. De toutes ces formules aussi, on peut dire, semble-t-il, qu'elles sont davantage des marques de respect que des souhaits proprement dits. On peut encore leur ajouter des phrases du même genre que l'on lit dans les lettres de El-Amarna et que M. GALLING paraît avoir heureusement caractérisées en les nommant: „Ehrfurchtsformeln”, formules d'hommage ⁴⁾. Le roi lui-même se sert d'une pareille formule à son endroit et affirme ainsi qu'il est en santé, à savoir, en état de faire valoir ses droits et faire exécuter ses ordres ⁵⁾.

Ceci amène à se poser la question si l'acclamation: Vive le roi! bien le sens d'un simple vœu. Ne devons-nous pas plutôt songer à une reconnaissance ou à un acquiescement comme dans le cas des formules de serment? Il semble qu'on y affirme son assurance en la vitalité de la personne royale tout comme dans les serments on proclamait la puissance du Dieu vivant en s'y soumettant. Il est bien

¹⁾ *Op. laud.*, p. 91.

²⁾ vi 12; xii 3; et חייהוה iii 9.

³⁾ A. COWLEY, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.*, Oxford 1923. Cf. aussi les numéros 31, 37-39, 41, 42, 56, 70.

⁴⁾ K. GALLING, *B.R.L.*, Tübingen 1937, s.v. Brief.

⁵⁾ El-Amarna No. 99. — On comparera aussi avec la formule accadienne *is^u šamaš^u marduk sa-am-su-i-lu(na) à šippar it-mu-ú*, le serment par les dieux, le roi et la ville.

On remarquera en outre אמצא־הן Gen. xxxiii 15, signifie: j'ai trouvé grâce, et non: que je trouve grâce. Cf. aussi 1 Sam. i 18.

certain que celui qui émettait un serment se plaçait en quelque manière sous la juridiction de celui qu'il attestait ¹⁾.

Dans les mots **יְיָ הַמֶּלֶךְ** le verbe **יְיָ** est un jussif. Les grammairiens GESENIUS-KAUTZSCH, DAVIDSON et JOÛON citent quelques passages où la forme du verbe est incontestablement celle du jussif mais où la signification est néanmoins celle d'un indicatif ²⁾. GESENIUS-KAUTZSCH voit en cette sorte de jussif l'expression d'une forte conviction.

Voici quelques exemples, autres que ceux des grammairiens susdites ³⁾, de ces jussifs à sens d'indicatifs. David dit aux gens de Jabès en Galaad: „Vous êtes bénis — **בְּרָכִים** — de l'Éternel — et maintenant l'Éternel use envers vous de bonté — **יַעֲשֶׂה יְהוָה עִמָּכֶם חֶסֶד** — et de fidélité. Moi aussi je vous ferai du bien — **וְגַם אֲנֹכִי אַעֲשֶׂה אֲתֶכֶם הַטּוֹבָה** — parce que vous avez agi de la sorte” (2 Sam. ii 6). Il faut entendre que les habitants de Jabès sont effectivement bénis de Dieu et que David agit en conséquence.

Au verset 8 du premier chapitre du livre de Ruth, nous lisons que Naomi prit congé de ses belles-filles avec les mots qui suivent: „Allez, retournez chacune à la maison de sa mère! L'Éternel use de bonté envers vous — **יַעֲשֶׂה יְהוָה עִמָּכֶם חֶסֶד** — comme vous l'avez fait envers ceux qui sont morts et envers moi.” Le *qere* est au jussif, le *ketib* — **יַעֲשֶׂה** — à l'indicatif. C'est que Naomi parle avec assurance de ce que l'Éternel accomplira.

Le passage de Jérémie xx 14, contrastant avec les bénédictions de 2 Sam. ii 5, déclare: Maudit est le jour (où je suis né) — **אָוִיר הַיּוֹם** —. La suite de ce texte comporte un jussif avec la négation **אֵל**

¹⁾ J. HEMPEL dans son article „Die israelitische Anschauungen von Segen und Fluch im Lichte altorientalischer Parallelen”, *ZDMG* 79, 1925, p. 20-110 aboutit à une position très proche de celle qui est ici soutenue. Il voit en Gen. i 22. 28 des paroles efficaces, „die wirkenden Worte”. Voyez aussi les textes de Palmyre, tirés de l'ouvrage de LIDZBARSKI, *Handbuch der nordsemitischen Epigraphik* I, 1898, p. 170s, que cite HEMPEL. Dans tous ces textes où il est fait emploi d'un parfait, la puissante bénédiction de Dieu est ressentie comme une réalité.

²⁾ GESENIUS-KAUTZSCH, *Hebr. Gramm.*, Leipzig 1902, § 109. A. B. DAVIDSON *Hebrew Syntax*, 3me éd., Edinburgh 1924, p. 93s. P. JOÛON, *Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique*, 2me éd., Roma 1947, § 114kl.

Il s'agit en ces cas de passages où le jussif est employé avec son sens propre. En des sens secondaires, le jussif peut équivaloir à un impératif, ainsi Gen. i 22 ou à une forme de souhait ainsi 1 Rois xx 32, Ps. cxix 175.

³⁾ Je fais cependant des réserves sur certains de ces exemples, ainsi Job xxiii 11

dont le sens est celui d'un indicatif: le jour où ma mère m'a enfanté n'est pas béni — אֶל־יְהִי כְרוֹךְ —. Semblablement, on trouve en Job xxiii 9 un jussif à sens d'indicatif en parallèle avec un verbe au mode indicatif: Est-il occupé au nord, je ne puis le voir — וְלֹא־אֶחֱזוּ ¹⁾, se cache-t-il au midi, je ne puis le découvrir — וְלֹא אֶרְאֶה ²⁾.

Ailleurs que dans l'acclamation: Vive le roi! la forme יְהִי se lit encore dans la Bible, nommément dans un oracle sur Ruben, Deut. xxxiii 6, יְהִי רִאיוֹן וְאֵל יָמָת, ce qu'il faut probablement traduire: „Ruben vivra et ne mourra pas.”; (d'après Gen. xlix 17, יְהִי־דָן נָחֵשׁ, „Dan sera un serpent sur le chemin” ³⁾). Sur le sens des mots יְהִי לְבַבְכֶּם dans Psaume xxii 27 et Ps. lxix 33, passages souvent traduits: „que votre coeur vive”, je n'ai pas d'opinion arrêtée.

On conclura, en fin d'analyse, que le terme יְהִי dans l'acclamation יְהִי הַמֶּלֶךְ est suivant toute probabilité un jussif à sens d'indicatif. Cette acclamation paraît être du même ordre que les formules de serment, composées à l'aide des mêmes termes. Elle est une vive manifestation par la voix d'un acquiescement à l'autorité royale. Elle affirme à la fois la réalité de cette autorité et la dépendance ressentie à son égard. La salutation: Roi, vis à jamais! est du même genre. Cette acclamation est un hommage par lequel on reconnaît que le roi a pouvoir de vie et de mort. Ceux qui la prononcent reconnaissent l'exercice de cette autorité et s'y soumettent ⁴⁾.

יְהִי הַמֶּלֶךְ signifie donc: le roi vit, il détient la puissance royale. La similitude de cette acclamation avec les serments où la vie du roi est mise en parallèle avec celle de Dieu, indique que le pouvoir royal a été, en Israël aussi, mis en relation avec l'autorité divine. Ce rapprochement n'a toutefois entraîné aucune „divinisation” du roi, car c'est de Dieu que le roi reçoit une plénitude de vie de laquelle il demeure, devant lui, responsable.

¹⁾ Voir BEER dans KITTEL, *Bibl. Hebr.*, note: = אֶחֱזוּ.

²⁾ On notera encore: 1 Sam. xviii 17; Deut. xxxii 18 (?); Jug. v 13 (?); Job xx 26; xxiv 14.

³⁾ L'oracle sur Dan de la bénédiction de Moïse se sert de l'indicatif: „Dan est un jeune lion—”.

⁴⁾ On comparera avec la formule qui fut longtemps usitée en France lors de la mort du souverain: „Le roi est mort, vive le roi!”, c'est à savoir: le roi est mort, mais la royauté n'a point péri car elle se continue en l'héritier du trône.

ZWEI VERKANNTÉ MILITÄR-TECHNISCHE TERMINI IM ALTEN TESTAMENT

VON

OTTO EISSFELDT

Halle (Saale)

Zu den nicht wenigen Postulaten, die in der gegenwärtigen alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft fast dogmatisches Ansehen geniessen und daher kaum mehr auf ihre Berechtigung hin geprüft werden, gehört dies, dass das קֶשֶׁת „Bogen“ von 2 Sam. i 18, der Einleitung zu Davids Trauerlied auf Sauls und Jonathans Tod, als fehlerhaft gestrichen oder umgestellt oder irgendwie geändert werden müsse. Von den vielen und mannigfachen hierher gehörenden Vorschlägen verdienen zwei in Erinnerung gerufen zu werden, der von JULIUS WELLHAUSEN und der von AUGUST KLOSTERMANN. WELLHAUSEN, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis untersucht*, 1871, S. 151 bemerkt zu 2 Sam. i 18: „Die einzige Erklärung von קֶשֶׁת, die den Namen einer Erklärung verdient, diejenige EWALD's („genau“), hat doch so viel gegen sich, dass es mir, da LXX ER.¹⁾ das Wort nicht bietet, vorsichtiger erscheint, an ein zufälliges Eindringen desselben an dieser Stelle zu denken, zumal die kurze Ausdrucksweise ללמד statt ללמדה nur gewöhnlich ist, wenn das Zeitwort auch nicht einmal durch ein Adverbium erweitert ist. Vielleicht lautete eine zu הפרשים v. 6 bestimmte Correctur (nach 1 Sam. xxxi 3) בעלי קֶשֶׁת, wovon בעלי bei הפרשים v. 6 und קֶשֶׁת hier eindrang, indem v. 6 und v. 18 in den Columnen sich gegenüberstanden. Auf diese Weise wäre beiden Versen geholfen“. KLOSTERMANN, *Die Bücher Samuelis und der Könige ausgelegt*, 1887, S. 131 aber vokalisiert den als בְּנֵי־יְהוּדָה קֶשֶׁת „die Söhne Judas Bogen“ überlieferten Konsonantenbestand בְּנֵי יְהוּדָה קֶשֶׁת in בְּנֵי יְהוּדָה קֶשֶׁת „Vernimm, o Juda, Grausames“ um, versetzt diesen Stichos an den Schluss von v. 18 und lässt ihn so mit dem ersten Stichos von v. 19, in dem er הַצִּבִּי „die Zier“ in הַעֲצָבִי „trage Leid“ ändert, einen Langvers bilden: „Vernimm, o Juda, Grausames/

¹⁾ ER. = Editio Romana.

und trage Leid, o Israel". Diese beiden Korrekturen unserer Stelle haben denn auch Anklang gefunden und sind von vielen übernommen worden. Aber so ansprechend sie sein mögen, unzutreffend und unnötig sind sie darum doch.

Bis gegen den Ausgang des 18. Jahrhunderts ist für unsere Stelle die in der Vulgata zum Ausdruck kommende ¹⁾ und im übrigen von den jüdischen Kommentatoren des Mittelalters vertretene Auffassung massgebend geblieben, die in ihr eine Anordnung Davids, die Judäer im Gebrauch des Kriegsbogens zu unterweisen, ausgesprochen findet. So übersetzt JOANNES CLERICUS (1657-1737), *Veteris Testamenti Libri Historici*, 1733, S. 280 die erste Hälfte von 2 Sam. i 18: dixitque eam (die in v. 17 genannte lamentatio) se composuisse, ut Iudae posteri arcu uti edocerentur" und fügt dem als Erklärung hinzu: „David autem d'ixit hanc se lamentationem composuisse, ut discerent tribules sui arcu uti; quod ea conservaretur memoria raelii, in quo Saul sagitta ictus saluti suae fuga consulere non potuerat, & in quo forte sagittarii magnum ad victoriam attulerunt momentum"; JO. HEINR. MICHAELIS (1668-1738), *Biblia Hebraica*, 1720 bemerkt zu 2 Sam. i 18 am Rand: „iussit etiam, ut filii Iudae docerentur tractare arma & arcum pro salute populi, coll. 1 Sam. xxxi c. xiii 19 sqq.", und J. C. NACHTIGAL, *Psalmen gesungen vor Davids Thronbesteigung*, 1797, S. 241 übersetzt oder erklärt den Anfang unseres Verses als „Bestimmt, die Israeliten zu Waffenübungen aufzufordern". Aber ein Jahr später lehnen AUGUSTI und HÖPFNER, *Exegetisches Handbuch des Alten Testaments*, fünftes Stück, 1798 unter Nennung von CLERICUS und NACHTIGAL diese Erklärung ausdrücklich ab, und dasselbe tun reichlich 100 Jahre später K. BUDDE, *Die Bücher Samuel erklärt*, 1902, S. 197 und P. DHORME, *Les Livres de Samuel*, 1910, S. 269, wobei der erste ohne Nennung von Vertretern dieser Auffassung nur bemerkt: „Die Kinder Juda den Bogen zu lehren" hat im eigentlichen Sinne (vgl. Jdc. iii, 2 מִלְחָמָה) hier keine Stelle", der zweite aber ausdrücklich sagt, dass es sich bei dieser von ihm abgelehnten Auffassung um die von rabbinischen und älteren christlichen Exegeten vertretene handle.

Die anscheinend zum alten Eisen geworfene frühere Erklärung unserer Stelle hat jetzt aber in C. H. GORDON, „Ugarit as link between Greek and Hebrew literatures" (*Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 29, 1954, S. 161-169), S. 164 wieder einen beredten Anwalt gefunden, und es

¹⁾ Et praecepit ut docerent filios Iuda arcum.

sieht fast so aus, als ob dieser ganz von sich aus, ohne Wissen davor, dass er darin manchen Vorgänger gehabt hat, zu ihr geführt worden ist. Im Zusammenhang mit der Vergleichung der israelitischen Epik mit der griechischen und der so veranlassten Würdigung des ausse Jos. x 13 auch 2 Sam. i 18 erwähnten סֵפֶר הַיָּשָׁר „Buch des Aufrechten“ also nicht eigentlich als Frucht exegetischer Bemühung um diese Stelle, hat sich ihm nämlich dies als ihr Sinn ergeben, dass sie eine Befehl, die Judäer im Gebrauch des Bogens zu unterweisen, enthalte. „Das Buch des Aufrechten hatte, wie das Schahnamä in Iran die Aufgabe, nationalen Stolz zu wecken und so die Kampfkraft des Volkes zu erhöhen. Das ist die Bedeutung von ‚zu lehren die Söhne Judas den Bogen‘ (v. 18), eine Wendung, mit der διδασκόμενος πολέμου (Ilias 16, 811) zu vergleichen ist“.

Einerlei ob לִלְמַד בְּנֵי-יְהוּדָה קֶשֶׁת an seiner jetzigen Stelle ursprünglich und dann als von וַיֹּאמֶר „und er gebot“ abhängig aufzufassen ist oder nicht — die Schwerfälligkeit des Ausdrucks legt die Annahme nahe, dass v. 18 in seiner überlieferten Form nicht ursprünglich ist, sondern nahe —, so empfiehlt es sich jedenfalls, bei der alten Auffassung jene Worte als „zu lehren die Söhne Judas den Bogen“ zu bleiben oder sie zu erneuern. Dabei braucht die Wendung nicht auf die Ausbildung in der Handhabung des Bogens eingeschränkt zu werden. Vielmehr ist es angesichts des Vorkommens von „mit Schwert und Bogen“ (Gen. xlviii 22, Jos. xxiv 12, 2 Reg. vi 22) oder „mit Bogen und Schwert und Waffe“ (Hos. i 7; vgl. Hos. ii 20, Psalm lxxvi 4) durchaus möglich und gar wahrscheinlich, dass sie allgemeiner im Sinne von „in Waffenhandwerk ausbilden“, „kriegstüchtig machen“ zu verstehen ist, also genau so wie לִמַּד מִלְחָמָה „das Kriegshandwerk lehren“ (Jdc. 2; vgl. 2 Sam. xxii 35 = Psalm xviii 35, Jes. ii 4 = Micha iv 3, Psalm cxliv 1, Cant. iii 8). Dass von solchem Ethos, wie es Davids Trauerlieder beseelt, getragene Lieder von David selbst oder von anderen als zu Weckung und Erhaltung des rechten Geistes unter Kriegsmännern geeignet beurteilt und dementsprechend verwertet worden sind, ist gut denkbar, und es mag auch an dem sein, dass sowohl das Buch des Aufrechten als auch das Buch der Kriege Jahwes, aus dem Num. xxi 14-16 ein Fragment mitgeteilt wird, zu demselben Zweck zusammengestellt oder ihm doch jedenfalls dienstbar gemacht worden sind. 2 Sam. i 18 ist לִמַּד mit einem doppelten Akkusativ verbunden: dem der Menschen, die belehrt, und dem des Gegenstandes, über den

sie belehrt werden sollen. In der Überschrift von Psalm lx, v. 1-2, die man des öfteren 2 Sam. i 18 an die Seite gestellt hat und von der R. KITTEL, *Die Psalmen übersetzt und erklärt*, 1914, S. 227 etwa sagt: „Die Wendung ‘zum Lehren’ לְלַמֵּד erklärt sich wohl nach 2 Sam. i 18, wo מִי bei der Elegie Davids auf Saul und Jonatan dieselbe Bemerkung hat. Es ist demnach wohl möglich, dass in der Zeit des Sammlers unsrer Lieder die jüdische Jungmannschaft dieses besonders kriegerisch klingende Lied zu lernen hatte“, ist לְלַמֵּד „Zum Einüben“ absolut gebraucht, wie es bei Wörtern, die Termini technici geworden sind, auch sonst zu gehen pflegt, dass sie schlagwortartig verwendet werden. Im übrigen scheint die Einleitung zu Psalm lx, also Ps. lx 1-2, so verstanden werden zu wollen, dass hier von einer schweren Notlage die Rede ist, zu deren Meisterung das von David und seinen Mannen gebetete Lied mitgeholfen hat. Wie der ja zweifellos von 2 Sam. viii abhängige Verfasser der Überschrift dazu gekommen ist, aus dem dort Erzählten eine David und seine Truppen bedrohende Gefahr und deren wunderbare Abwendung herauszulesen, wird sich freilich kaum mehr feststellen lassen.

Das zweite Verbum, das an manchen Stellen deutlich als ein militärtechnischer Terminus gebraucht wird, aber in dieser seiner Bedeutung, wie es scheint, bisher nicht gebührend gewürdigt worden ist, ist נָסָה.

Das GESENIUS-BUHL'sche *Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament* gibt in seiner 16. Auflage von 1915 für das Wort als Bedeutungen an: „1. prüfen, auf die Probe stellen, versuchen . . . 2. einen Versuch machen“, und LUDWIG KOEHLER, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*, 1953 stimmt damit im wesentlichen überein, wenn es bei ihm heisst: „נָסָה . . . 1. auf die Probe stellen, versuchen . . . 2. e. Versuch machen, versuchen“. An den meisten Stellen ist das Wort in der Tat so zu verstehen, aber doch nicht überall. Ex. xv 25 „Dort gab er ihm Gesetz und Recht und dort נָסָה“, wo nicht ganz sicher ist, ob Jahwe oder Mose das Subjekt der Handlung bildet, aber der empfangende Teil doch jedenfalls das Volk ist, bedeutet נָסָה eher so etwas wie „einüben“, nämlich in den eben mitgeteilten Bestimmungen, als „auf die Probe stellen“, und ebensowenig scheint es bei Dtn xxxiii 8, wo es in einer an Jahwe gerichteten und sich auf Mose oder die Lewiten beziehenden Rede heisst „den נָסִיתִי in Massa, מַרְיָבָה an den Wassern von Meriba“, den Sinn von „versuchen“ zu haben. Hier, wo wohl sicher auf Ex. xxxii 25-29 oder doch eine dem dort Berichteten ähn-

liche Erzählung Bezug genommen wird, wäre „den du ertüchtigtest“ viel besser am Platze als „den du versuchtest“, wie denn das mit **נָסָהוּ** parallele **תָּרִיבָהוּ** hier so etwas wie „du kämpftest für ihn“ oder „du lehrtest ihn kämpfen“ bedeuten muss. Die verbreitete Neigung, an beiden Stellen **נָסָה** mit „versuchen“ wiederzugeben, ist angesichts der Tatsache, dass die Erzählung von Israels Wüstenwanderung des öfteren Fälle nennt, in denen Gott die Israeliten versucht (Dtn viii 2. 16) oder die Israeliten Gott versuchen (Ex. xvii 2. 7) und dass dabei wenigstens manche Stellen deutlich auf das bei Kadesch zu suchende Massa anspielen, auf das auch Ex. xv 25 und Dtn xxxiii 8 mit ihrem **נָסָה** hinweisen, schon verständlich. Aber die an allen diesen Stellen vorgenommene volksetymologische Ableitung des Namens Massa von dem Verbum **נָסָה** besagt keineswegs, dass hier immer an dieselbe Bedeutung des Verbums gedacht sein müsse. Vielmehr schwingen dabei die verschiedenen dem Verbum eigenen Bedeutungsnuancen mit; man muss es schon dem jeweiligen Zusammenhang ablauschen, an welche in den einzelnen Fällen gedacht ist, und da drängt sich für das **נָסָה** von Ex. xv 25 und Dtn xxxiii 8 dem Beobachter so etwas wie „einüben“ geradezu auf.

Diese Bedeutung des Verbums liegt weiter vor in der Stelle 1 Sam. xvii 39, wo es, nachdem vorher erzählt war, wie David Sauls Gewand angelegt hat und mit dessen Schwert sowie mit Helm und Panzer ausgerüstet worden ist, von David heisst: **וַיֵּאָלֶּה** zu gehen, denn nicht **נָסָה**. Und David sagte zu Saul: Ich kann darin nicht gehen, denn nicht **נָסִיתִי**. So legte David die Rüstung ab“. Das hier zweimal vorkommende **נָסָה** wird ziemlich allgemein mit „versuchen“ übersetzt, und das bringt die Ersetzung des als fehlerhaft betrachteten **וַיֵּאָלֶּה** durch ein anderes, als zu „versuchen“ besser passend empfundenes Verbum mit sich, etwa durch **וַיֵּלֶא** „und er wurde müde“ — so das GESENIUS-BUHL'sche *Handwörterbuch* — oder das von einem **אלה** III abgeleitete **וַיֵּאָלֶּה** „und er war unfähig“, das LUDWIG KOEHLER in seinem *Lexicon* vorschlägt. Bei Wiedergabe von **נָסָה** mit „einüben“, „üben“ erübrigt sich die Änderung oder andere Ableitung von **וַיֵּאָלֶּה**; „er schickte sich an“, „er unternahm es“, „er wagte es“, „er machte den Versuch“ — dergleichen bedeutet

a וַיִּצָּל — ist dann durchaus am Platze, und „Da versuchte er zu gehen, denn er hatte es nicht geübt, und David sagte zu Saul: Ich kann darin nicht gehen, denn ich habe es nicht geübt“ ist ganz das, was der Zusammenhang erfordert.

Schliesslich wird auch zu erwägen sein, ob man Jdc. iii 1, wo von bestimmten Völkern gesagt wird, dass Jahwe sie in Kanaan belassen habe „um zu נִסּוּת Israel, alle, die nicht vertraut waren mit allen Kampfarten Kanaans“, die übliche Wiedergabe von נִסָּה durch „versuchen“, „auf die Probe stellen“ nicht durch „einüben“, „einexerzieren“ oder dergleichen ersetzen muss. Dass zwei Verse weiter, Jdc. ii 4 das נִסּוּת hier so viel wie „auf die Probe stellen“ bedeutet, indem hier von der Belassung jener Völker gesagt wird, sie habe den Zweck, Israel durch sie auf die Probe zu stellen (לְנִסּוֹת), „ob sie den Geboten Jahwes, die er ihren Vätern durch Mose geboten habe, gehorchten“, bedeutet kein Gegenargument. Denn so gewiss hier für נִסָּה durch eine Umgebung die Bedeutung „auf die Probe stellen“ gefordert wird, so sehr legt der Zusammenhang des נִסָּה von v. 1, wo nicht nur von dem נִסּוּת der mit den Kampfarten Kanaans nicht vertrauten Israeliten die Rede ist, sondern in v. 2 als Zweck der hier von Jahwe verfolgten Massnahme ausdrücklich der genannt wird, dass die im Kriegshandwerk unerfahrenen israelitischen Generationen darin ausgebildet werden sollten, für das dort vorkommende נִסָּה die Bedeutung „üben“ nahe. Dass in dem kurzen Abschnitt Jdc. iii 1-6 zwei verschiedene Bedeutungen von נִסָּה so dicht beieinander stehen, ist gar nicht verwunderlich, und derartiges findet sich öfter. So stossen sich in Dtn xxvii 1-8 und Jos. viii 30-35 die zur Errichtung eines Opfer-Altars bestimmten Steinblöcke mit den Steinen, die, mit Kalktünche überzogen, zur Aufnahme einer Niederschrift des deuteronomischen Gesetzes dienen sollen, und in Dtn xxxi 9-xxxii 47 schliessen sich das Lied Moses und das deuteronomische Gesetz, von denen beiden hier erzählt wird, dass ihre Niederschrift und ihre Verkündung angeordnet und vollzogen worden ist, eigentlich gegenseitig aus. Wenn dort die Altarbausteine und die Beschriftungssteine, hier das Lied Moses und das Gesetz Moses doch friedlich beieinander stehen, so erklärt sich das daraus, dass die älteren Erzählungen von den Altarsteinen und dem Moselied von Redaktoren, die diese neutralisieren und in die von ihnen selbst eingeführten Grössen der Beschriftungs-

steine und des Gesetzes glaubten umdeuten zu können, um die diesen nennenden Erzählungszüge vermehrt worden sind. Ich habe für Dtn xxvii 1-8, Jos. viii 30-35 und Dtn xxxi 9-xxxii 47 diese Redaktions-technik in meinem Aufsatz über „Die Umrahmung des Mose-Lieder“ Dtn xxxii 1-43 und des Mose-Gesetzes Dtn i-xxx in Dtn. xxxi 9-xxxii 44”¹⁾ etwas genauer zu beschreiben versucht. Aber im Grunde stellt der ganze Werdegang des Alten Testaments und schliesslich auch seine allmähliche Ausgestaltung zur Bibel nichts anderes als die wiederholte Anwendung dieses Verfahrens dar: die älteren Stoffe werden belassen, wollen aber im Sinne der über sie gelegten Schichten verstanden sein.

¹⁾ *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg*, Jahrgang IV, 1954/55. *Gesellschaftswissenschaftliche Reihe*.

ZUM TEXT VON JES. XLI 8—13

VON

G. FOHRER

Wien

1. Die mehrfach beklagten starken Abweichungen in der Abgrenzung der einzelnen Einheiten in der Schrift Deuterocesajas¹⁾ machen sich auch in der Gliederung von Kap. xli bemerkbar. Gewiss werden Jes. xli 8-13 nicht selten als selbständige Einheit betrachtet²⁾. Oft aber wird der Abschnitt in einen grösseren Zusammenhang gestellt und mit weiteren Versen zu einer Einheit verbunden: mit den vorhergehenden³⁾ oder den folgenden⁴⁾ oder den vorhergehenden und folgenden Versen⁵⁾. Gelegentlich wird der Abschnitt auseinandergerissen und verschiedenen Einheiten zugeteilt⁶⁾.

¹⁾ Vgl. H. GRESSMANN, „Die literarische Analyse Deuterocesajas“, *ZAW* 4 (1914), S. 254-297; J. BEGRICH, *Studien zu Deuterocesajas*, 1938, S. 1 f.

²⁾ F. PRÄTORIUS, *Die Gedichte des Deuterocesajas*, 1922, S. 50 (mit Vorbehalt); J. VOLZ, *Jesaja II*, 1932, S. 17-20; J. BEGRICH, „Das priesterliche Heilsorakel“, *ZAW* 52 (1934), S. 81-92; *Studien zu Deuterocesajas*, 1938, S. 6; P. AUVRAY — J. STEINMANN, *Isaie*, 1951, S. 158 f.; C. R. NORTH, *Isaiah 40-55*, 1952, S. 52 f.; J. BRUNO, *Jesaja*, 1953, S. 167 f.

³⁾ xli 1-13: H. GRESSMANN, *a.a.O.*, S. 277; M. HALLER, *Das Judentum* (Die Schriften des Alten Testaments II 3), 1925², S. 27-29; S. SMITH, *Isaiah chapters 1-13*, 1944, S. 183. — xli 1-4 + 8-13: S. MOWINCKEL, „Die Komposition des deuterocesajanischen Buches“, *ZAW* 49 (1931), S. 91; A. BENTZEN, *Jesaja*, II 1948, S. 20-23. — xli 4b-13: W. CASPARI, *Lieder und Gottessprüche der Rückwanderer Jesaja 40-55*, 1934, S. 84.

⁴⁾ xli 8-16: W. O. E. OESTERLEY — TH. H. ROBINSON, *An introduction to the books of the Old Testament*, 1934, S. 268; J. A. BEWER, *The Book of Isaiah II*, 1950, S. 15. — xli 8-10 + 17-20: K. MARTI, *Das Buch Jesaja*, 1900, S. 279-282. — xli 8-20: K. BUDDÉ, *Das Buch Jesaja Kap. 40-66* (E. KAUTZSCH, *Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments I*), 1922⁴, S. 660-662; J. RIDDERBOS, *De profetie Jesaja*, II 1953³, S. 46-50. — xli 8-29: E. KÖNIG, *Das Buch Jesaja*, 1926, S. 363-366.

⁵⁾ xli 1-29: J. FISCHER, *Das Buch Isaias*, II 1939, S. 40 (+ xlii 8-12); J. ZIEGLER, *Isaias*, 1948, S. 119-121; U. E. SIMON, *A theology of salvation*, 1953, S. 68.

⁶⁾ xli 8-10, 11-16: B. DUHM, *Das Buch Jesaja*, 1922⁴, S. 303-305. — xli 8-10, 11-13: L. KÖHLER, *Deuterocesaja (Jesaja 40-55) stilistisch untersucht* (BZAW 37), 1923, S. 11 f., 106. — xli 1-10*, 11-13: S. MOWINCKEL, *Jesajaboken*, II, Kap. 10-66 (S. MICHELET-S. MOWINCKEL-N. MESSEL, *Det Gamle Testamente*, III), 1944, S. 206-208.

Jedoch sprechen viele Gründe dafür, Jes. xli 8-13 als selbständige Einheit abzutheilen:

a) Inhaltlich gehören xli 8-13 zusammen, weil die positive Heilzusage von 8-10 mit der Verheissung des Untergangs der Feinde 11-13 fortgesetzt wird. All diese Verse wenden sich an Israel und heben sich dadurch von xli 1-6 ab, die an die Völkerwelt gerichtet sind. Der in sich geschlossene Abschnitt xli 14-16 ist auf Grund der Stichworte „sich fürchten“ und „helfen“ an 8-13 angehängt worden.

b) Strophisch gliedern xli 8-13 sich in die umfangreicheren Strophen 8-10 und 11-13²⁾, während die vorhergehenden und folgenden Einheiten aus kürzeren Strophen bestehen (xli 1-6 = Strophe zu 2-4-4 Langversen; xli 14-16 = Strophen zu 2-2-2; xli 17-20 = Strophen zu 2-2-2-2).

c) Stilistisch erweist sich der Abschnitt xli 8-13 durch die a) Kernwort in 10 und 13 wiederkehrende Zusage **אל תירא** und **רתיך** als Einheit. Diese Zusage erscheint in einer nahezu kehrversartige Weise am Schluss der beiden Strophen.

d) Gattungsmässig zählt der Abschnitt zu den Heils- oder Erhörungsrakeln, die in den Klageliedern ihren Platz zwischen Klage, Bitte und Gewissheit der Erhörung haben. J. BEGRICH hat dies in einzelnen nachgewiesen³⁾.

e) Insbesondere können xli 8-13 nicht aufgeteilt werden, so dass 11-13 eine selbständige Einheit bilden soll. Sonst wird der in diesen Versen Angeredete nur durch das Pronomen der 2. Person und als völlig unzureichend bezeichnet, während das Beziehungswort sich tatsächlich in 8-10 findet⁴⁾.

2. Die 1. Strophe ist in Jes. xli 8-10 enthalten und besteht aus Langversen, die mit Ausnahme des ersten zweigliedrig sind und 3 + 4 Hebungen aufweisen; am Anfang von 9 ist **אשר** wohl als redaktionelle

¹⁾ xli 7 ist ein späterer Zusatz.

²⁾ So auch M. HALLER, *a.a.O.*, im Zusammenhang seines Abschnitts xli 1-13 und A. BRUNO, *a.a.O.*

³⁾ J. BEGRICH, *a.a.O.*; schon H. GRESSMANN, *a.a.O.*, S. 288, hat xli 8-13 als „Offenbarungsrede“ gehörig bezeichnet. Die Zuordnung zu den Botensprüchen durch L. KÖHLER, *a.a.O.*, S. 106, lässt den grösseren Zusammenhang ausser acht.

⁴⁾ Die Annahme von S. MOWINCKEL, „Die Komposition des deuteromesianischen Buches“, *ZAW* 49 (1931), S. 91, dass vor xli 11-13 eine Einleitung formel verloren gegangen sei, auf die sich die Pronomina bezögen, entbehrt jeder Grundlage im Text und seinen Versionen.

verknüpfende Glosse zu streichen ¹⁾. Nur xli 8 fällt mit 3 überlieferten Versgliedern aus diesem Rahmen:

ואתה ישראל עבדי יעקב אשר בחרתיך זרע אברהם אהבי

Meist wird dieser Text als dreigliedriger Vers beibehalten. Nun kommen solche Langverse zwar bei Deuterojesaja vor: 3 aufeinanderfolgende in xlii 6-7 (als 2. Strophe des Abschnitts xlii 5-7), je 1 in xlv 3a; xlix 7aß, 14; l 1aß; sie sind demnach selten. Daher wird manchmal angenommen, dass in xli 8 b ein Halbvers verloren gegangen ist ²⁾. Doch wäre dies der einzige Fall in den Worten Deuterojesajas; in allen anderen Einheiten sind die Langverse vollständig erhalten und überliefert. Demgegenüber ist einmal erwogen worden, xli 8aß als späteren Zusatz auszuschneiden ³⁾. Das ist sicher unzutreffend, da Deuterojesaja mehrfach Israel und Jakob nebeneinander nennt. Statt dessen dürfte eher das 3. Versglied xli 8b als ergänzende Glosse zu 8a zu betrachten und zu streichen sein.

Vom זרע Abrahams wird zwar schon sehr früh geredet (Gn. xii 7, nach O. EISSFELDT zu L gehörig), doch ist mit Recht darauf hingewiesen worden, dass man auf die Abrahamsverheissung erst in spätnachexilischer Zeit besonderen Nachdruck gelegt hat ⁴⁾. In der Prophetie wird Abraham erstmalig in Ez. xxxiii 24 erwähnt, jedoch nur in dem dort zitierten Ausspruch der im Jahre 587 in Palästina zurückgebliebenen Judäer. Sie beanspruchen den Besitz des Landes, der ihnen desto mehr gebühre, als Abraham es schon als Einzelner zugesprochen erhalten habe, während sie sogar viele seien. Ezechiel lehnt diesen Anspruch bekanntlich ab. Dieses Wort setzt Deuterojesaja voraus. Er nimmt in li 2 den Hinweis auf Abraham als Einzelnen auf und interpretiert ihn nunmehr in positivem Sinn, wobei es ihm allein auf die unzerstörbare Einheit zwischen Abraham und dem Israel des Exils ankommt:

Blicket auf Abraham, euren Vater,
auf Sara, die unter Wehen euch gebär;
denn als Einzelnen hab ich ihn gerufen,
hab ihn gesegnet und gemehrt!

¹⁾ Vgl. L. KÖHLER, *a.a.O.*, S. 11.

²⁾ B. DUHM, *a.a.O.*; S. MOWINCKEL in den in Anm. 3 und 6 genannten Arbeiten, wobei in der letzteren אשר in xli 9 als erstes Wort des ausgefallenen Halbverses betrachtet wird; P. AUVRAY — J. STEINMANN, *a.a.O.*

³⁾ F. PRÄTORIUS, *a.a.O.*, S. 50.

⁴⁾ P. VOLZ, *a.a.O.*; K. GALLING, *Die Bücher der Chronik, Esra, Nehemia* (ATD 12), 1954, S. 127; vgl. die bestätigenden Ausführungen von J. JEREMIAS in *TbWNT* I, 1933, S. 7 f.

Von dieser Auffassung bis zu der in Jes. xli 8b sich findenden ist aber noch ein weiter Weg. Vorerst schliessen sich noch nach-exilische Worte an Jes. li 2 an: Jer. xxxiii 26 spricht von Israel als der Nachkommenschaft Abrahams, Isaaks und Jakobs, Mi. vii 20 von Israel als Abraham und Jakob, während Jes. lxiii 16 diese Verbindung ablehnt („denn Abraham weiss nichts von uns“). Erst Jes. xxix 22 bringt Abraham als den von Gott Erlösten in eine engere Beziehung zu Jahwe. Sie wird in Gn. xxiii 6, das der Priesterschrift zugehört, durch die Anrede Abrahams als „Vertreter (oder Fürst) Gottes“ noch deutlicher. Die letzte Stufe in der Entfaltung dieses Gedankengutes ist in 2 Chr. xx 7 erreicht; dort wird Abraham wie in Jes. xli 8b als „Freund“ Jahwes bezeichnet, diese Bezeichnung aber als schon bekannt verwendet.

Immerhin ist es angesichts der späten Stellen, die zu dieser Bezeichnung hinführen, sehr fraglich, ob sie in Jes. xli 8b auf Deuteronomios zurückgehen kann, besonders da ihm die Gestalt Abrahams in li 2 aus ganz anderem Grunde wichtig ist. Man wird daher Jes. xli 8b als spätere Ergänzung von 8a betrachten müssen¹⁾, so dass xli 8 sich formal den folgenden Versen angleicht und wie 9-10 nur einen zweigliedrigen Langvers mit 3 + 3 Hebungen enthält:

ואתה ישראל עבדי יעקב אשר בחרתיך

3. Die 2. Strophe ist in Jes. xli 11-13 enthalten und besteht in MT aus 6 Langversen, die zweigliedrig sind und 3 + 2 Hebungen aufweisen. Dieser Text ist durchweg ohne jede Änderung beibehalten worden, doch ergeben sich bei näherer Betrachtung einige auffällige Beobachtungen.

Mehrfach ist der jetzige Text als unbefriedigend empfunden worden. Die dreifache Wiederholung in 11-12 ermangele eines tiefen Gedankens²⁾, 12b wiederhole eigentlich nur 11b³⁾; die Verse seien schriftstellerisch minderwertig und könnten recht wohl ein Einschub von späterer Hand sein⁴⁾. Man wird diese Anstösse als wenigstens teilweise berechtigt anerkennen müssen, wenn man den Text unbefangen liest.

¹⁾ Dadurch wird die von CH. C. TORREY, „Isaiah 41“, *HTbR* 44 (1951), S. 121-136, vertretene Ansicht, dass der in Jes. xli 2 f., 25 f. genannte Held nicht Kyros, sondern Abraham sei, noch unwahrscheinlicher, als sie ohnehin ist.

²⁾ M. HALLER, *a.a.O.*

³⁾ B. DUHM, *a.a.O.*, S. 305.

⁴⁾ K. BUDDE, *a.a.O.*, S. 661; nach K. MARTI, *a.a.O.*, stammen xli 11-16 wahrscheinlich nicht von Deuteronomios.

Ebenso erheben sich gewisse Bedenken, wenn man die strophische Gliederung der Worte Deuterojesajas untersucht. Sieht man von den 3 einstrophigen Einheiten ab ¹⁾, so ergibt sich, dass in den 34 Mehrstrophigen Abschnitten in 27 Fällen die Strophen einer Einheit jeweils die gleiche Zahl von Lang- oder Kurzversen umfassen ²⁾. Für die übrigen Einheiten ergibt sich folgende Tatbestand: In 4 Einheiten sind die Strophen unregelmässig lang (xli 1-6 = 2-4-4 Langverse; xlii 10-17 = 5-2; xlix 1-6 = 1-5-2-5; li 1-8 = 7-7-4), in 1 Einheit sinkt in den Strophen die Zahl der Langverse (xlv 20-25 = 4-3), in 2 Einheiten steigt sie (xli 21-19 = 7-8; xlii 5-7 = 2-3). Ein weiteres Beispiel der letzten Art läge in xli 8-13 vor, falls der Text von 11-13 einwandfrei ist (5-6 Langverse). Aus der strophischen Gliederung lässt sich kein abschliessendes Urteil gewinnen; doch kann die überwiegend gleichmässige Strophenlänge in den Worten Deuterojesajas andere Gründe stützen, die für eine Textänderung sprechen.

Aufschlussreicher sind stilistische Beobachtungen. Es zeigt sich zunächst, dass der Ausdruck אָפֶס von Jes. xli 12b für Deuterojesaja bezeichnend ist. Von insgesamt 46 Vorkommen (einschliesslich 4 konjizierten) erscheinen bei ihm 13 (ein weiteres in der Glosse in xlv 9a), ausser xlv 22 und lii 10 sämtlich in negierender Bedeutung. Die Verbindung von אֵין mit אָפֶס ist nur für ihn bezeichnend (xli 12; xlv 14 und cj. xli 24, 29).

Anders verhält es sich mit der Redewendung יִהְיֶה כְּאֵין וְיֵאבֹד in Jes. xli 11b. Bei 118 Vorkommen des Verbs יֵאבֹד im Kal ist es mit xli 11b nur 6mal verbunden, jedoch in anderer Weise als in Jes. xli 11b. Wenn 4mal stehen beide Ausdrücke in den verschiedenen Versgliedern eines Langverses parallel nebeneinander (Dt. xxxii 28; Jer. vii 2a; Ps. cxlii 5 in der Reihenfolge יֵאבֹד und אֵין, Jer. xlix

¹⁾ xlix 13 mit 2 Versen. — xl 6-8; xlii 14-15; xliv 23; xlv 9-10; xlvii 12-13; xlviii 7-8 und lv 6-7 mit je 3 Versen. — xl 1-2; xlv 21-22; xlvii 3-4 und xlix 7 mit je 2 Versen. — xl 3-5; xlv 1-5; xlvii 9-11; xlix 22-23, 24-26; li 9-10; liv 1-3 und lv 11 mit je 5 Versen. — liv 4-6 und lv 8-9 mit je 6 Versen. — xl 9-11; xlv 1-3, 14-15; xlviii 20-21 und xlix 8-12 mit je 7 Versen. — xlii 22-28 mit 9 Versen. Ausser Acht bleiben ferner l 10-11 und lii 13-liv 12, sowie die später zugefügten Abschnitte.

²⁾ Strophen zu je 2 Versen: xli 14-16, 17-20; xlii 1-4; xlv 6-8; xlv 4-7. — Strophen zu je 3 Versen: xl 27-31; xlii 9-13, 16-21; xlvii 1-2; lv 12-13. — Strophen zu je 4 Versen: xl 21-26; xlii 18-23; xliii 1-7; xlv 14-17; xlviii 12-16; l 1-3; lii 1-2; lv 1-5. — Strophen zu je 5 Versen: xl 12-18; xlv 24-28; xlviii 17-19; liv 10, 11-17. — Strophen zu je 6 Versen: xlvii 1-15; l 4-9. — Strophen zu je 7 Versen: xlviii 14-21; li 17-23.

7 in der Reihenfolge **אין**, **אבד** und **סרה**, also nirgends in der alleinigen Folge **אין** und **אבד** wie Jes. xli 11b); 2mal stehen die Ausdrücke in zwei Versgliedern oder Langversen als Ausdruck eines Folgeverhältnisses (Koh. v 13; ix 6 in der Reihenfolge **אבד** und **אין**). In Jes. xli 11b ist demnach nicht nur die jetzige Reihenfolge **אין** und **אבד** ungewöhnlich, sondern auch die Verwendung der beiden Ausdrücke innerhalb desselben Halbverses. Es fragt sich, ob die Redewendung **יהיו כאין** aus diesen Gründen entstanden angesichts des **כאין וכאפס** in 12b ursprünglich zum Text gehört hat.

Ähnliches gilt für die Redewendung **ולא תמצאם** in Jes. xli 12a. Bei 231 Vorkommen von **בקש** im Piel und Pual ist es 32mal verbunden¹). Man verwendet die Ausdrücke vor allem für das Suchen und (Nicht-)Finden von Menschen, Tieren und Weideplätzen, Dingen usw. von der älteren Zeit an²), für das Suchen und (Nicht-)Finden von Gott usw. vom Deuteronomium und Jeremia an³), in ethisch-religiöser Beziehung von Jeremia an⁴). Noch jünger ist die seltene Verwendung in dem Sinne, dass Frevler und Feinde nicht mehr gefunden werden, weil sie vernichtet sind. Da die Redewendung in Jes. xli 12a in der letzteren Art begegnet, fragt es sich, ob sie ursprünglich oder nicht vielmehr ein nachträglich hinzugefügter Zusatz ist.

4. Das Textproblem, das sich an Hand dieser Beobachtung erhebt, wird durch DSIa weiter beleuchtet und verschärft. Deutlich merkwürdigerweise fehlen bei DSIa in Jes. xli 11b-12a (Kol. xxxiv 15-16) gerade die beiden Redewendungen, deren Ursprünglichkeit die sprachliche Untersuchung in Frage stellt. Beruht dieser Tatbestand auf Fehlern des Abschreibers oder auf einer von MT abweichenden Vorlage, die einen kürzeren Text enthielt?

Die Frage ist deswegen nicht leicht zu beantworten, weil der Abschreiber in Kol. xxxiv zwischen Jes. xli 11 und 12 eine Lücke

¹) Die Verbindung von **דרש** mit **מצא** ist so selten (vgl. Jes. lv 6; 2 Ch. xv 15), dass sie in diesem Zusammenhang unberücksichtigt bleiben kann.

²) Jos. ii 22; 1 Sam. x 2, 14, 21; 2 Sam. xvii 20; 1 Kön. i 3; xviii 10; 2 Kön. xv 17; Jer. ii 24; Cant. iii 1 f.; v 6; Koh. xii 10; Est. ii 23; Esr. ii 62; Neh. vii 1; 1 Ch. iv 39 f.

³) Dt. iv 29; Jes. lxxv 1; Jer. xxix 13; Hos. v 6 (unecht); Am. viii 12 (Glossa); Prov. ii 4 f.; Koh. viii 17; 2 Ch. xv 15.

⁴) Jer. v 1; Ez. xxii 30; Hos. ii 9 (unecht); Koh. vii 28.

⁵) Glosse in Ez. xxvi 21 über Tyrus; Ps. xxxvii 36 nachexilisch; von der Stelle in der späten Stelle Jer. l 20.

n $1\frac{3}{4}$ Zeile = 23 cm gelassen hat, deren Ursache und Zweck nicht deutlich sind, besonders da nach dem Text von DSIa der in xli begonnene Satz in 12 zu Ende geführt wird ¹⁾. Man wird schwerlich vermuten dürfen, dass in Jes. xli 12 ein neuer Sinnabschnitt eingingen sollte, wie er oft durch Freilassen des Restes der vorhergehenden Zeile oder durch Einrücken der neuen Zeile ²⁾ angegeben wird. Diese Abteilung erfolgt gewiss mehrfach an falscher Stelle und zerstreut die tatsächliche Einheit ³⁾, in den meisten Fällen trifft sie aber mit dem wirklichen Beginn einer neuen Einheit zusammen oder endet sich wenigstens bei Absätzen innerhalb einer Einheit, wie sie sich durch inhaltliche Einschnitte, strophische Gliederung oder besondere Formeln ergeben. Niemals sonst wird ausser dem Rest der vorhergehenden noch zusätzlich eine weitere ganze Zeile frei gelassen oder ein Satz auseinandergerissen.

Ebensowenig genügt die blossе Annahme, dass der Abschreiber einen Rest gelassen habe, damit ein in seiner Vorlage unleserlicher Satz nachgetragen werden könne. Die Sachlage ist wesentlich verwickelter, besonders noch an weiteren Stellen, die sich in den verschiedenen Kolumnen jeweils an ähnlichem Ort befinden, Raum für Nachträge gelassen worden ist. So verhält es sich innerhalb der Zeile in Kol. xxxiii 19 und lii 23. Der Rest der begonnenen Zeile ist frei geblieben in Kol. xlv 15 und xlv 17, vielleicht auch in xxxii 14 und xlii 20; der Anfang der neuen Zeile in Kol. xlv 17 (ausser dem Rest der vorhergehenden Zeile), vielleicht auch in xxxviii 15; eine ganze Zeile oder mehr in Kol. xxviii 19-20; xxx 11-12; xxxiii 15-16 und xxxiv 15-16. Ein Teil dieser Stellen ist nachträglich vervollständigt und ausgefüllt worden — entweder vom Abschreiber selbst in Kol. xxx 11-12 oder von anderer Hand in Kol. xxviii 19-20 und xxxiii 15-16, 19. An anderen Stellen sind die Lücken geblieben: in Kol. xxxiv 15-16; xlv 17 und lii 23. An den übrigen Stellen liegen wahrscheinlich Besonderheiten vor, die noch zurückzukommen ist.

¹⁾ Vgl. J. LINDBLOM, „Deuterojesaja i den nyfunna Jesaja-handskriften från Estina“, *SvTeolKvart* 1950, S. 302-314; H. BARDTKE, *Die Handschriftenfunde des Toten Meer*, 1952, S. 63 f.; „Die Parascheneinteilung der Jesajarolle I von Amman“, *Festschrift Franz Dornseiff*, 1954, S. 32-75; C. KÜHL, „Schreibereigenheiten, Bemerkungen zur Jesajarolle (DSIa)“, *VT* 2 (1952), S. 311.

²⁾ Einrücken der Zeile findet sich mehrfach auch innerhalb eines Verses, ohne dass ein Sinnabschnitt gekennzeichnet wird, vgl. Kol. xiii 20, 31; xxi 22; xxxiv 23; xxxv 24.

³⁾ Kol. ii 26 f.; iii 17 f.; iv 2 f.; vi 14 f.; ix 2 f.; xviii 18 f.; xx 22 f., 28 f.; xxi 2 f.; xxvi 30 f.; xxviii 16 f.; xxxiii 24 f.; xxxv 6 f.; xliii 1 f.

Um diesen Tatbestand befriedigend zu erklären, müssen zwei Beobachtungen zusammengefasst werden:

a) J. HEMPEL hat nachgewiesen, dass — abgesehen von den Korrekturen — der hebräische Text in DSIa in zwei Entwicklungsstadien vorliegt, die sich in der Rechtschreibung deutlich voneinander abheben ¹⁾. P. KAHLE hat aus den von ihm ebenfalls festgestellten Unterschieden den Schluss gezogen, dass für die in DSIa vorliegende Abschrift des Jesajabuches zwei verschiedene Vorlagen benutzt worden sind ²⁾. Das erste Entwicklungsstadium des Textes findet sich in der ersten Vorlage, die Jes. i-xxiii in Kol. i-xxxvii umfasst; das zweite Stadium in der zweiten Vorlage, die für Jes. xxxix-lxvi in Kol. xxviii-liv verwendet worden ist. Nun gehören die — teilweise später ausgefüllten — Lücken sämtlich in den zweiten Teil von DSIa, so dass sie im Erhaltungszustand der zweiten Vorlage begründet sein müssen. W. H. BROWNLEE hat darauf hingewiesen ³⁾, dass die Lücken oft in den gleichen oder benachbarten Zeilen der Kolumnen gelassen worden sind, und mit Recht daraus geschlossen, dass der Abschreiber ein Manuskript vor sich hatte, das mehrfach am unteren Rande unregelmässig abgebröckelt war, und seine Auslassungen diesen Beschädigungen entsprechen; der Zustand von DSH liefert ein Beispiel dafür. Naturgemäss war es für den Abschreiber sehr schwierig, das Ausmass des fehlenden Textes zu schätzen, so dass er manchmal zu viel oder zu wenig Raum gelassen hat. Hinzu kommt, dass die Zeilenzahl der Vorlage in den einzelnen Kolumnen offenbar nicht gleich war; wahrscheinlich wies sie gerade in der Kolumne, die in DSIa Kol. xxxiv 15 f. endete, eine Zeile weniger als in der vorhergehenden auf, so dass der Abschreiber in Unkenntnis dessen, ausser dem Rest der Zeile xxxiv 15 noch eine weitere Zeile frei liess.

b) Man wird jedoch W. H. BROWNLEE nicht in der Annahme folgen müssen, dass die erste Vorlage von DSIa nur Jes. i-xxxviii enthalten habe, die zweite dagegen vollständig gewesen, wegen ihrer beschädigten Textes aber nur für Jes. xxxiv-lxvi herangezogen worden sei, wobei die abgebröckelten und später nachgetragenen Textstellen der Rolle beigelegt waren. Denn in Kol. xxxii 14 sind Jes. xxxviii

¹⁾ J. HEMPEL, „Beobachtungen an der „syrischen“ Jesajarolle vom Toten Meer (DSIa)“, *ZDMG* 101 (1951), S. 138-173.

²⁾ P. KAHLE, *Die hebräischen Handschriften aus der Höhle*, 1951, S. 72-77.

³⁾ W. H. BROWNLEE, „The manuscripts of Isaiah from which DSIa was copied“, *BASOR* 127 (1952), S. 16-21; vgl. ferner P. W. SKEHAM in *CBQ* 14 (1952), S. 82.

21-22 kein echter Nachtrag, für den absichtlich Raum gelassen worden wäre, sondern im Rest der Schlusszeile von Jes. xxxviii und am Rande als Zusatz aus einer anderen Vorlage beigelegt worden; die Verse sind sicher nicht ursprünglich, und die Vorlage des Abschreibers wird sie tatsächlich nicht enthalten haben¹⁾. Ferner kann der Abschreiber in Kol. xxxviii 14-15 und xlii 20 in seiner Vorlage durchaus den von MT abweichenden Wortlaut gefunden haben, der dann auch in der zur Korrektur benutzten Vorlage enthalten gewesen sein muss; in diesem Falle ist der Anfang von Kol. xxxviii 15 zur Kennzeichnung eines Sinnabschnitts eingerückt und nicht als Raum für einen Nachtrag, während in Kol. xlii 20 gar keine nachträgliche Auffüllung anzunehmen ist.

Wesentlicher aber sind die Gründe, die M. NOTH dafür beigebracht hat²⁾, dass man an zwei verschiedene Abschreiber denken muss, von denen der erste Kol. i-xxvii, der zweite Kol. xxviii-liv angefertigt hat. Es ist sicherlich auch völlig zutreffend, dass sie gleichzeitig gearbeitet haben.

Dies sind die beiden Beobachtungen, die zusammengefasst werden müssen. Es ist bei der Herstellung von DSIa mit zwei gleichzeitig arbeitenden Abschreibern zu rechnen, die zwei verschiedene Vorlagen benutzten und benutzen mussten, weil man eine noch im Gebrauch befindliche Rolle für diesen Zweck nicht in zwei Teile zerschneiden konnte und wollte. Die zweite Vorlage, die der zweite Abschreiber benutzte, war freilich teilweise beschädigt, so dass die Abschrift später ergänzt werden musste. Dabei stellte sich dann heraus, dass die zur Korrektur und Ergänzung benutzte Vorlage ausser in Kol. xxxii 14 auch in xxxiii 7 einen umfangreicheren Text aufwies, als der Abschreiber erwarten konnte. Umgekehrt kannte sie das vom Abschreiber in Kol. xxxiv 15-16 erwartete Mehr an Text für einen Zeilenraum von 23 cm nicht und konnte es nicht kennen. Aus der ganzen Überlieferung ist ja ausser den in Jes. xli 12aα enthaltenen 3 Wörtern kein weiteres Wort, geschweige denn ein ganzer Satz bekannt, den man hätte einfügen können, während in den anderen Fällen der ergänzte oder zu ergänzende Text aus der sonstigen Überlieferung bekannt ist.

¹⁾ Anders P. A. H. DE BOER, "Notes on text and meaning of Isaiah xxxviii 9-20", *OTS* 9 (1951), S. 174.

²⁾ M. NOTH, „Eine Bemerkung zur Jesajarolle vom Toten Meer“, *VT* 1 (1951), S. 224-226.

Wie aber verhält es sich mit der Wortgruppe **תבקשם ולא תמצאם** in xli 12aα? Es zeigt sich, dass in Kol. xlv 17 und lii 23 die erforderliche Korrektur übersehen oder vergessen worden ist. Da dieser Fall also begegnet, lässt sich schwer entscheiden, ob in Kol. xxxiv 15 der Nachtrag aus Jes. xli 12aα ebenfalls fälschlich unterblieben ist oder die Korrektur-Vorlage diese Wortgruppe ebensowenig enthielt wie die Abschreibe-Vorlage. Beides ist möglich. Aber da an dieser Stelle vom Abschreiber auffällig viel Raum frei gelassen war, der kaum übersehen werden konnte wie in Kol. xlv 17 und lii 23, wo es sich um freien Raum in oder am Ende der Zeile handelt, ist am ehesten anzunehmen, dass auch die Korrektur-Vorlage die fragliche Wortgruppe nicht enthalten hat.

Das Fehlen der ersten Wortgruppe **יהיו כאן** in Jes. xli 11bα wäre aber auch im anderen Falle noch nicht erklärt, da ihr Platz schon vor der vom Abschreiber gelassenen Lücke vor dem letzten Wort von Kol. xxxiv 14 ist. Für eine Ergänzung an dieser Stelle ist überhaupt kein Raum vorgesehen, so dass weder die Vorlage für den zweiten Teil von DSIa noch die Korrektur-Vorlage jene Wortgruppe in Jes. xli 11bα enthalten haben dürften. Dergleichen findet sich öfter. In den 65 Fällen, in denen DSIa gegenüber MT einzelne oder mehrere Wörter weniger hat, weist DSIa — abgesehen von Jes. xli 11-12 — 14mal mit grösster Wahrscheinlichkeit ¹⁾ und 16mal möglicherweise ²⁾ einen ursprünglicheren und besseren Text als MT auf, davon der zweite Abschreiber 9mal bzw. 6mal. So wird das Fehlen der Wortgruppe in Jes. xli 11bα ebenso wie in 12aα darauf beruhen, dass sie in der Vorlage des zweiten Abschreibers von DSIa nicht enthalten waren.

5. Keiner der unter 3. und 4. angeführten Gründe genügte für sich allein, um eine Textänderung in Jes. xli 11-13 zu rechtfertigen. Zusammengenommen aber stützen sie sich gegenseitig und machen die Annahme wahrscheinlich, dass die Redewendungen **יהיו כאן** in 11bα und **תבקשם ולא תמצאם** in 12aα nicht ursprünglich sind. Streicht man sie, so erhält man wie für Jes. xli 8-10 für 11-13 eine

¹⁾ In Kol. vii 13; xiii 26 (wenigstens die 13 Wörter in Jes. xvi 8, vgl. H. GUTHRIE in E. KAUTZSCH, *Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments*, I 1922⁴, S. 617); xx 17 zweimal; xxii 30; xxviii 25; xxx 25; xxxiii 7; xli 22; xliii 16, 18, 21; xlviii 25; xlix 26.

²⁾ In Kol. ii 18; iii 28; iv 1; viii 2; xi 1; xv 2 f.; xvii 2; xviii 21, 24; xxi 4 xxviii 17; xxxvi 13; xxxvii 26; xxxviii 14; xlix 5; li 9.

weite) Strophe von ebenfalls 5 Langversen. Von ihnen sind der 1. und 3.-5. in MT richtig überliefert, während der 2. im Anschluss an DSIa ¹⁾ in Jes. xli 11b-12a lautet:

ואנשי מצתך

וִיאֲבֹדוּ אֲנֹשִׁי רִיבְךָ.

¹⁾ Vor אנשי in 12aβ ist mit DSIa ein ו einzufügen, während כל vor אנשי in 11bβ nicht übernommen werden muss, obwohl 11aβ es als möglich erscheinen lässt. Die Lesart ויבשו (unter Auslassung eines Vokalbuchstabens) an Stelle von ויאבדו (vgl. S. LOEWINGER in VT 4 (1954), S. 157) ist nicht wägenswert.

LE PAPYRUS PASCAL D'ÉLÉPHANTINE ET LE PROBLÈME DU PENTATEUQUE

PAR

P. GRELOT

Paris

J'ai tenté dans une précédente étude ¹⁾ de reconstituer le texte du papyrus pascal d'Eléphantine en me fondant sur les parallélismes bibliques qu'on peut y déceler. Tout essai de ce genre comporte une part d'hypothèse sur laquelle on ne saurait appuyer aucune conclusion. Mais dans le cas présent, en laissant de côté la restauration des lignes mutilées là où elle est conjecturale, il reste assez de contacts entre le papyrus et le Pentateuque pour qu'on y trouve matière à réflexion. Je me propose d'en reprendre ici l'examen sous un angle très précis : *peut-on, à partir du papyrus, éclairer sur certains points le problème du Pentateuque?* Il me semble que oui. Pour le montrer, j'aborderai successivement deux questions : 1) la place du document dans l'élaboration des lois sacerdotales ; 2) sa situation par rapport au Deutéronome. Ainsi se précisera sa relation exacte avec le Pentateuque. En retour, il fournira un précieux repère chronologique pour l'histoire de celui-ci.

I. LA PLACE DU DOCUMENT DANS L'ÉLABORATION DES LOIS SACERDOTALES

Le document est en rapport avec les lois sacerdotales, c'est certain. Mais on peut, à ce sujet, poser une question précise : a-t-il pour arrière-plan le *texte* de ces lois définitivement fixé, tel qu'il figure dans la Bible ; ou bien se réfère-t-il à un état du droit coutumier antérieur à la fixation de ce texte ; ou bien encore marque-t-il par rapport à lui un *développement* appréciable ? De ces trois possibilités

¹⁾ P. GRELOT, „Etudes sur le Papyrus pascal d'Eléphantine”, VT IV (1953) p. 349-384. On trouvera le texte du document p. 370, le tableau des parallélismes bibliques p. 368, la bibliographie du sujet p. 349-50. Le sigle A.P. 21 renvoie à l'édition de COWLEY, *Aramaic Documents of the Fifth century*.

c'est la seconde qui me paraît répondre aux faits. Pour l'établir, j'examinerai point par point les contacts du papyrus avec la législation sacerdotale.

1. *Le calendrier liturgique.* Le calendrier liturgique mentionné dans les lignes 4 & 5 (cf. 8) est celui de Lev. xxiii 5-6 et Nb. xxviii 16-17. Différent du calendrier deutéronomique (Dt. xvi 1-8), celui-ci dérive d'un prototype plus ancien attesté pour la première fois dans Ez. xlv 21-25 (pour la Pâque et les Huttes). Il importe assez peu à la question présente que ce passage vienne du prophète lui-même, comme l'admet BERTHOLET, ou constitue un supplément inséré à une date indéterminée par un éditeur du livre, comme le pensent COOKE et FOHRER¹⁾. Toujours est-il que Lev. xxiii ajoute à Ez. xlv 21 une précision supplémentaire en distinguant nettement la Pâque (14 Nisan) des sept jours d'Azymes (du 15 au 21). Le parallélisme de A. P. 21/4-5 avec Lev. xxiii 5-6 (cf. Ex. xii 15-16a) permet de suppléer presque à coup sûr le mot „Pâque” à la ligne 5, après la supputation des „14 jours”. En ce qui concerne la date de la Pâque et des Azymes, la législation supposée par le papyrus coïncide donc avec la législation sacerdotale qu'a recueillie la Bible. Mais on ne saurait tirer de cette constatation des conclusions excessives.

En effet, dans Lev. xxiii deux textes se trouvent amalgamés: un calendrier sacerdotal auquel appartiennent les v. 5-6, et une notice sur les fêtes liturgiques qui provient du code de sainteté. Le calendrier sacerdotal est reconnaissable à sa formulation très homogène: introduction au v. 4; développements parallèles aux v. 5-8, 21a (le début manque), 24b-25, 27 (mais 28-32 renferme une suite de règles complémentaires analogues à celles d'Ex. xii 15-20), 34b-36; conclusion aux v. 37-38 (avec traces de retouches). De son côté la notice propre au code de sainteté se retrouve aux v. 10-14 (12-13 semble une glose qui renvoie à Nb. xv 1-12), 15-20 (18b-19a paraît secondaire, cf. Nomb.

¹⁾ BERTHOLET, *HZAT*, p. 160. — COOKE, *ICC*, p. 429, 493 & 503. — FOHRER, *Die Hauptprobleme des Buches Ezechiel*, p. 77 & 101. Dans Ez. xlv 21, le TM diffère du grec. COOKE et BERTHOLET suivent le grec pour le sens *mais non pour l'ordre des mots*, puisque ils déplacent חג (voir dans COOKE les motifs qui justifieraient ce déplacement). En fait, Nomb. xxviii 16-17 présente une séquence analogue à celle d'Ezéchiél (attestée par le TM et la LXX): חג שבעת ימים מצות יאכל. ... On peut donc se demander si l'ordre des mots du texte d'Ezéchiél ne doit pas être conservé, la difficulté de son état présent étant attribuable à une lacune très ancienne, antérieure à la traduction grecque (etc. ... ובחמישה עשר יום לחדש). En pareil cas, Lev. xxiii et Nomb. xxviii n'ajouteraient rien à Ez. xlv sur ce point particulier. Conjecture, sans doute, mais pas plus arbitraire que le déplacement de חג.

xxviii 27-31)¹), 39-43 (mais 39c pourrait être destiné à harmoniser les deux textes). Le rapport du papyrus pascal avec Lev. xxiii 5-6 ne permet donc pas d'affirmer qu'en 419 le chapitre tout entier existait dans son état actuel: le rédacteur du document pouvait avoir en main un texte du calendrier sacerdotal *encore indépendant* de l'ensemble où il figure aujourd'hui.

En outre, il est certain que ce calendrier a subi une évolution, notamment en ce qui concerne la date de l'Expiation. Ez. xlv 18-21 semble connaître deux grandes expiations annuelles, aux néoménies du 1er et du 7ème mois (en suivant le grec pour le v. 20, avec COOKE et BERTHOLET). Lev. xxiii 27 n'en connaît qu'une, fixée au 10 du 7ème mois. Au temps d'Esdras, cette Expiation ne paraît pas avoir été célébrée entre le 1er et le 15 du 7ème mois (Neh. viii 13-18)²). La rédaction du calendrier sacerdotal utilisée dans Lev. xxiii apparaît donc au terme d'un processus dont on suit difficilement les étapes. Rien ne permet d'affirmer qu'en 419 ce processus était achevé: le papyrus pascal peut avoir eu pour base un état du calendrier (et donc un stade rédactionnel) intermédiaire entre Ez. xlv et Lev. xxiii. Bref, pour éclairer le problème du Pentateuque, il faut d'autres critères que l'introduction du calendrier sacerdotal à Eléphantine.

2. *La pureté rituelle.* La mention de la pureté rituelle à la ligne 6 du document l'introduit dans l'ambiance — si caractéristique — du code de pureté (Lev. xi-xv). Or la préoccupation fondamentale de ce code domine la rédaction d'un certain nombre de textes insérés dans les autres codes (par exp: Lev. vii 19-21, xvi, xvii 15-16, xviii 24-30, xx 22-25; Nomb. ix 6-13, xix). Il s'agit là de *lois complémentaires* destinées à harmoniser les codes entre eux³). La notation, brève mais énergique, du papyrus pascal l'y apparente. Faut-il en conclure que Hānaniah, comme les auteurs de ces textes, connaît le code de pureté dans sa rédaction définitive? Ce serait trop dire. Mais il connaît à

¹) O. EISSFELDT, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, p. 156.

²) Cf. RUDOLPH, *Esra und Nehemia (H₂AT)*, p. 153. — K. GALLING (*Alt Test. Deutsch*, p. 234-35) attribue Neh. viii 13-18 à la seconde couche rédactionnelle du livre. Quoi qu'il en soit de ce point, la différence entre ce récit et le calendrier de Lev. xxiii et Nomb. xxviii-xxix (en ce qui concerne la date de l'Expiation) montre que son rédacteur suit ici une source d'information digne de foi. Autrement, il n'eût pas manqué de faire cadrer sa présentation des faits avec la lettre de la Loi, comme dans Esdr. vi 19-22 et même Neh. viii 18b (cf. Lev. xxiii 36 et Nomb. xxix 35).

³) Sur ce groupe de lois complémentaires: H. CAZELLES, (art) *Loi israélite*, SDB, T 5, col. 504-505. Cf. *Le Lévitique*, Bible de Jérusalem, p. 17 & 98.

tout le moins la *tradition juridique* qui s'est cristallisée dans le code ¹⁾; il partage le souci essentiel de son — ou ses — rédacteurs, tout comme les juristes auxquels on doit les lois complémentaires sus-dites.

Aucun article du Pentateuque ne formule explicitement le précepte d'être pur pour participer à la Pâque. Hananiah se réfère à un point de *droit coutumier* que l'on peut, sans risque d'erreur, présumer très ancien: dès la haute époque, la pureté rituelle devait être requise pour la Pâque comme pour la manducation de toutes les choses sacro-saintes (2 Sam. xxi 5-6 atteste au temps de David une pratique codifiée seulement dans la loi de sainteté: Lev. xxii 3-7, cf. xxiv 5-9). Or Nomb. ix 6-13 *suppose admis* le même principe de droit coutumier; sans s'arrêter à le formuler, le rédacteur envisage les cas de conscience que peut poser son application et, pour les résoudre, énonce une règle nouvelle: la Pâque du second mois. Le Chroniste, qui connaît cette règle (2 Chr. xxx), semble faire allusion à une loi *écrite* prescrivant la pureté à l'occasion de la Pâque (xxx 18); mais il s'agit probablement de Nomb. ix 13, où le précepte se trouve noté implicitement. Le fait que le papyrus pascal mentionne la pureté rituelle est un indice supplémentaire que sa ligne 5 concernait bien la Pâque. Mais il se réfère visiblement à un état du droit coutumier *moins élaboré* que Nomb. ix 6-13. Ce dernier texte entérine le résultat d'une casuistique que le papyrus paraît encore ignorer. Sans vouloir majorer la portée de cette constatation (car l'argument *a silentio* est toujours d'un maniement délicat), on est ainsi incliné à placer *après* 419 la rédaction de Nomb. ix 6-13.

Certes, on peut se demander si Hananiah ne prend pas appui sur Lev. vii 19b-21. On sait en effet que les juristes sacerdotaux d'époque tardive tendaient à rattacher, dans leurs synthèses juridiques raisonnées, les préceptes particuliers à des principes généraux. La comparaison de Nomb. ix 6-13 avec Lev. vii 19b-21, fait penser qu'ils assimilaient le repas pascal aux sacrifices de communion: d'où la nécessité de la pureté rituelle dans les deux cas. Mais rien ne prouve que Hananiah ait fait explicitement cette assimilation. D'autre part,

¹⁾ Il va de soi que le code de pureté recueille et systématise des données très anciennes. Le souci de la pureté rituelle n'est pas absent de la tradition deutéronomique (Deut. xii 15, 22; xiv 3-20; xv 22; xxiii 10-15). On en retrouve la trace dans Malachie (i 11; iii 3) et les mémoires de Néhémie (xiii 9, 22, 30). Mais il ne constitue pas dans ces livres un trait dominant comme, par exemple, dans Ezéchiél où les idées de souillure et de purification ont une place centrale (Ez. xxii 26; xxiv 13; xxxvi 16 suiv.; xxxvii 23; xxxix 12, 14; xlv 23). Il paraît certain que la codification des règles de pureté s'est faite dans un milieu imprégné de l'influence d'Ezéchiél. Hananiah se rattache à ce milieu.

Lev. vii 19b-21 (article complémentaire destiné à faire le lien entre le code de pureté, Lev. xi-xv, et le code des sacrifices, Lev. i-vii)¹ s'apparente trop étroitement à Nomb. ix 6-13 (article complémentaire destiné à faire le lien entre le code de pureté et la loi de la Pâque) pour que l'on puisse dissocier la rédaction des deux textes. Seulement à la différence du second, le premier ne reflète pas une casuistique tardive: il rappelle un point de droit coutumier très ancien. Ainsi même si l'on admettait que le *principe* formulé dans Lev. vii 19b-21 fonde l'ordre d'„être purs” dans le papyrus pascal, il ne s'ensuivrait pas que la *rédaction* du passage soit antérieure à 419.

3. *Le chômage au 1er et au 7ème jour des Azymes.* L'interdiction du travail au 1er et au 7ème jour des Azymes figure en trois endroits Lev. xxiii 7-8, Nomb. xxviii 18 & 25, Ex. xii 16. (Deut. xvi 8 ne la mentionne que pour le 7ème jour). Dans le papyrus, il y a une lacune (début de la ligne 7) après: „Ne faites aucun travail...” Comme le document suit le calendrier sacerdotal et *non* celui de Deut. xvi, on peut légitimement en inférer que, sur ce point, il coïncidait avec Lev. xxiii et parallèles. Quoi qu'il en soit, il faut relever un détail significatif. L'expression employée pour définir le chômage des Azymes n'est pas identique partout. Deut. xvi 8²) porte: „Tu ne feras aucun travail” (פֶּל מְלָאכָה), — ce qui assimile *totale*ment ce chômage à celui du sabbat (cf. Ex. xx 10, xxxi 14-15, xxxv 2; Deut. v 14; Lev. xxiii 3). Ex. xii 16 recourt à la même expression („il ne sera fait aucun travail”), mais en y joignant une *précision* qui en restreint la portée: lors des convocations sacrées de la semaine des Azymes, il reste permis de faire cuire la nourriture de chacun, — tâche interdite le jour du sabbat, où l'on ne peut ni ramasser du bois, ni faire du feu (Ex. xxxv 1-3; Nomb. xv 32-36). Ces trois derniers textes ont visiblement pour source la *casuistique*; ils résolvent trois problèmes pratiques relatifs à la règle du chômage, tout comme Nomb. ix 6-13 résolvait un problème pratique posé par d'autres lois.

¹) Rectifier sur ce point VT IV, art. cit. p. 360: „Lev. vii 19b-21 (et non 20-21) ... renvoie (et non: appartient) au code de pureté”. Quatre lignes plus loin, lire: „Lev. xv”, au lieu de: „Lev. vii”. Dans le tableau de la p. 368, mettre entre (): (Lev. vii 19b-21) au lieu de: Lev. 20-21.

²) La Bible du centenaire (T. ANDRÉ, révisé par A. LODS et A. LECERF) attribue xvi 8 au RP, avec renvoi à Ex. xii 16. Mais il y a des différences notables entre ce verset et la législation sacerdotale: mention de l'assemblée solennelle (עֲצֵרָת) chômage sans restriction, et ordonné seulement au 7ème jour. Il faut donc maintenir l'authenticité deutéronomique du verset (cf. S. R. DRIVER, ICC, p. 194).

Finalement, dans Lev. xxiii et Nomb. xxviii-xxix, une *différence formelle* est établie entre le chômage du sabbat et celui des Azymes. Pour ce dernier, le rédacteur emploie une expression spéciale qu'on ne retrouve *que* dans Lev. xxiii 7-8, 21, 25, 35-36, Nomb. xxviii 18, 25, 26, xxix 1, 12, 35, *et nulle part ailleurs*: „Vous ne ferez aucun travail servile” (פֶּל מִלְאָכָה עֲבָדָה), c'est-à-dire pratiquement: le gros travail manuel (H. CAZELLES, *Le Lévitique*, Bible de Jérusalem, p. 107, note b), notamment le travail agricole (CHAPMAN AND STREANE, *The book of Leviticus*, Cambridge Bible, p. 127)¹). Or, dans un texte juridique aucune nuance de langage n'est gratuite. Visiblement, le chômage moins strict des principales fêtes est par là distingué du chômage total réservé au sabbat et au jour de l'Expiation, — sanctionné celui-là par les peines les plus graves (Lev. xxiii 3, cf. Ex. xxxi 14-15 et xxxv 2; Lev. xxiii 28 & 30, xvi 29, Nomb. xxix 7). La formule précise „aucun travail servile” apparaît ainsi au terme d'une élaboration législative dont Ex. xii 16 marque une étape intermédiaire, — le point de départ d'une assimilation pure et simple du chômage des fêtes (notamment des Azymes) à celui du sabbat: à l'expérience, des nuances sont introduites dans l'application du principe. *Le papyrus pascal ne connaît encore aucune de ces nuances*, puisqu'il porte: „Vous ne (ferez) aucun travail”. Sans doute la suite de la phrase tombe-t-elle dans une cune (début de la ligne 7); mais, en dehors de la mention des jours où le travail est interdit, il n'y a pas la place nécessaire pour des précisions analogues à celles d'Ex. xii 16. La rédaction de ce dernier texte est donc postérieure à 419, mais antérieure à la date où le calendrier sacerdotal reçut sa forme définitive (à plus forte raison: à la date où il fut amalgamé avec le code de sainteté dans Lev. xxiii).

4. *La boisson interdite*. La ligne 7 du papyrus porte l'interdiction d'une boisson dont le nom reste inconnu²). Cette interdiction n'a aucun parallèle exact dans la Bible, mais elle figure dans la Mishna. Il s'agit donc d'un point de droit coutumier demeuré longtemps non-écrit, recueilli très tardivement avec un certain luxe de précision (Pesachim iii 1). Ainsi, *il est absolument certain que Hananiah se réfère*

¹) J. BONSIIVEN, dans la traduction révisée de la *Bible de Crampon* (1952), traduit: „aucune espèce de travail”. Mais cette façon d'entendre l'expression est contredite par Ex. xii 16.

²) G. R. DRIVER, *Aramaic Documents*, 6/3, ne connaît que deux boissons: חמץ או שרץ. Si Hananiah s'exprime selon la terminologie courante, la lettre Arsham donne un sérieux appui à la conjecture de COWLEY, et mes précédentes considérations sur ce point (loc. cit., p. 361-62) sont à réviser.

à d'autres données que celles du Pentateuque. L'origine de la coutume en question nous échappe. Le fait que le Pentateuque ne mentionne point ne prouve pas qu'elle a pris naissance après la fixation définitive; il montre seulement que le droit coutumier a toujours sa place dans le judaïsme, non seulement pour expliciter le droit écrit, mais à côté de lui pour en compléter les données. Du même coup, les conclusions tirées précédemment, après la confrontation du papyrus et de Nomb. ix 6-13, Lev. vii 19b-20, Ex. xii 16, Lev. xxiii 7-8, sont confirmées: *l'arrière-plan du document est constitué par le droit coutumier en usage dans les milieux sacerdotaux* 419. Les textes auxquels il s'apparente le plus étroitement cristallisent dans la plupart des cas, le même droit coutumier, mais plus élaboré.

5. *L'interdiction du levain et du pain fermenté.* Cette interdiction est essentielle à la tête des Azymes, est ancienne (Ex. xxiii 15 et xxxviii 18); elle figure aussi bien dans la législation deutéronomique (Deut. xvi 3-4)¹⁾ que dans les textes sacerdotaux (Ex. xii 15 & 19-20). Dans le papyrus, le dernier mot de la ligne 7 fait malheureusement défaut. Mais la ligne 8 renferme une précision de calendrier identique à celle d'Ex. xii 18: " [...] depuis le 14ème jour de Nisan au coucher du soleil jusqu'au 21ème jour de Nisan au coucher du soleil [...]". La raison d'être de cette addition à la loi des Azymes est aisée à découvrir. Il s'agit de déterminer sans équivoque possible le laps de temps durant lequel les pains sans levain sont seuls autorisés. L'existence d'une double supputation du temps dans les pays où les juifs sont dispersés — l'une ayant pour point de départ le lever, l'autre le coucher du soleil — oblige à éviter les formules ambiguës? Or ce n'est pas d'Ex. xii 15 n'est pas absolument claire: „dès le premier jour vous enlèverez le levain de vos maisons”. Dans le Deutéronome, cette confusion n'était à craindre, car les sept jours des Azymes étaient intégrés à la célébration de la Pâque (Deut. xvi 1-3) qui commençait avec l'immolation des victimes au coucher du soleil (4 & 6) et se terminait par la manducation nocturne (7). Mais, le calendrier sacerdotal distinguant nettement les deux fêtes, il est devenu indispensable de préciser le moment exact où commence la période „du 15 au 21 Nisan”. Le papyrus pascal montre qu'en 419 les juristes sacerdotaux avaient déjà coutume

¹⁾ Cf. Ex. xiii 6-7, dont la provenance est discutée. BEER (*HZAT*, p. 100) l'attribue au RP. Cette opinion paraît avoir la préférence de COUROYER (Bible de Jérusalem, *L'Exode*, p. 70). CAZELLES (*SDB*, T. 5, col. 503) rapproche plutôt le fond d'Ex. xiii 1-16 du Décalogue yahviste (Ex. xxxiv), tandis que EISSFELDT y retrouve la trace de la Laienquelle (*Einleitung*, p. 217).

formuler explicitement cette indication quand elle s'avérait utile. C'était le cas en Egypte, où la journée commençait le matin (le début l'année était marqué en principe par le lever héliaque de l'étoile this: A. ERMAN - H. RANKE, *La civilisation égyptienne*, trad. fr. p. 7) ¹⁾. Mais il serait imprudent de supposer qu'Ex. xii 18-20 vise la diaspora égyptienne (les diasporas orientales paraissant cependant hors de cause). Il ne faut pas non plus conclure trop vite qu'en 419 cet article additionnel était déjà rédigé sous sa forme actuelle et figurait dans la Loi écrite. Sa formulation l'apparente étroitement à Nomb. 13-14; on peut donc l'attribuer à la même couche rédactionnelle, postérieure à 419 (cf. sup.). Mais il a recueilli une donnée de droit coutumier antérieure au papyrus pascal.

On remarquera que la même précision de calendrier figure dans un autre passage des compilations sacerdotales, — et dans un seul: Lev. xxiii 32b. Or les v. 28-32 ont une allure identique à celle d'Ex. xii 18-20. Eux aussi renferment une législation complémentaire insérée dans le contexte qui lui convient. Le texte parallèle de Nomb. xix 7 n'en garde aucune trace.

6. *Parallélismes littéraires*. On relève dans le papyrus pascal, à deux signes d'intervalle, deux formules bien attestées dans la phraséologie d'Ezéchiel et du courant sacerdotal. „Comptez quatorze jours” (Ex. xiv 4): cf. Lev. xv 13 & 28 (c. de pureté), xxiii 15-16, xxv 18 (c. de sainteté), Ez. xlv 26; mais également Deut. xvi 19. „Soyez avertis” (Ex. xvi 6, racine זָהַר): cf. Lev. xv 31 (c. de pureté), Ez. iii 17-21 (7 fois), xxxiii 1-9 (7 fois), 2 Chr. xix 10 ²⁾. Comme ces expressions se rencontrent aussi ailleurs, l'argument fondé sur la stylistique ne serait guère probant s'il était seul. Rapproché des analyses qui précèdent, il confirme les résultats: dépendance de la tradition d'Ezéchiel, familiarité du code de pureté, proximité du code de sainteté où le calendrier sacerdotal a finalement été inséré.

La confrontation rigoureuse du document d'Eléphantine avec les textes d'origine sacerdotale auxquels il s'apparente conduit aux conclusions suivantes. 1) Le document ne dépend pas directement de ces textes, mais du *droit coutumier* dont ils représentent, sur plusieurs points, une forme plus évoluée. 2) La *rédaction* de Nomb. ix 6-13,

¹⁾ Cf. S. H. HORN and L. H. WOOD, *The Fifth-century Jewish calendar at Elephantine*, JNES, XIII (1954), n° 1, p. 6. Je dois à l'obligeance de Mr. HORN la communication de cet article, dont j'ai eu connaissance trop tard pour pouvoir en faire état dans ma précédente étude (VT, IV, loc. cit., p. 376).

²⁾ Détails dans VT IV, art. cit., p. 357 et 360.

Lev. vii 19b-21, Ex. xii 15-20 (et par voie de conséquence Lev. xx 28-32) est donc *postérieure* à 419. 3) En ce qui concerne la date de Pâque et des Azymes, le calendrier sacerdotal existait avant 419; le papyrus pascal n'apporte aucune lumière sur l'époque à laquelle l'Expiation a été fixée au 10 du 7ème mois; la rédaction actuelle du calendrier (mention du „travail servile”) semble postérieure à ce code d'Ex. xii 16; *a fortiori* en est-il de même pour la fusion du calendrier et du code de sainteté dans Lev. xxiii. 4) On entrevoit par là combien le „code sacerdotal” ressemble peu à un bloc uniforme. Il s'agit plutôt d'une *tradition juridique* fixée peu à peu dans des compilations raisonnées, enrichie et précisée dans ses détails pratiques grâce au travail des juristes à qui il revenait de la rendre applicable pour faire passer dans les mœurs (d'où les décisions de casuiste, les articles complémentaires, les points de suture entre les codes). 5) En 419, cette tradition juridique était, pour une part, déjà fixée (influence probable du code de pureté sur le papyrus; existence certaine d'un texte du calendrier des fêtes, intermédiaire entre Ez. xlv et la rédaction utilisée dans Lev. xxiii). Pour une autre part, elle était en pleine élaboration. Son dernier développement, pour autant qu'on puisse en juger en le comparant au document d'Eléphantine, n'a pas pris la forme d'un code suivi, mais d'*articles additionnels* insérés dans le contexte qui convenait à chacun d'eux. 6) Certains éléments du droit coutumier de l'époque n'ont pas pris place dans le Pentateuque mais se sont néanmoins conservés.

A partir de ces conclusions, il sera intéressant d'étudier la dernière étape de la rédaction sacerdotale. Mais auparavant, il faut confronter le papyrus pascal avec le Deutéronome: en est-il réellement indépendant?

II. LE PAPYRUS PASCAL ET LE DEUTÉRONOME

1. *Absence de référence au Deutéronome.* L'absence de toute référence au Deutéronome dans le papyrus est d'autant plus frappante que les contacts avec la législation sacerdotale y abondent. Sans doute peut-on objecter que le texte est lacunaire: est-il certain que dans les parties manquantes ne figurait aucune expression deutéronomique, comme le supposait dans sa restauration de la ligne 8? En fait, une telle conjecture ne serait appuyée par aucun indice *positif*. En outre, compte tenu de la longueur présumée des lignes, il semble que les références bibliques *certaines* des fragments conservés réduisent

considérablement la part des hypothèses sans fondement solide dans la reconstruction des lignes détériorées ¹⁾.

2. *Contradiction avec le Deutéronome dans la question de la Pâque.* Si les zymes étaient seuls en cause dans notre document, il suffirait peut-être d'admettre qu'en 419, aux yeux des juristes juifs liés à l'administration perse, les réglementations sacerdotales avaient remplacé celles du Deutéronome, moins précises. Mais un tel raisonnement est sans valeur s'il est vrai qu'à la ligne 5 figure l'ordre (ou l'autorisation) de célébrer la Pâque: contradiction flagrante avec un principe fondamental du Deutéronome (Deut. xvi 2 & 5-7) dont la codification finale de la loi mosaïque a consacré la valeur. Certains historiens ont jugé cette contradiction si difficile à admettre qu'ils ont préféré nier, ou bien qu'il fût question de la Pâque dans le papyrus appelé „pascal” (par antiphrase ²⁾), ou bien que son expéditeur fût un juif orthodoxe ³⁾. En fait, tous les indices décelables dans le texte parlent en sens inverse. Comme il s'agit d'une question cruciale, il convient d'en reprendre l'examen détaillé.

A) Le parallélisme certain de la ligne 5 B avec Lev. xxiii 6 et Nomb. xxviii 17 invite à mettre la mention du 14 Nisan, à la fin de la ligne 4, en rapport avec Lev. xxiii 5 et Nomb. xxviii 16: Hānaniah commence par fixer avec précision la date de la Pâque. D'après l'interprétation solidement fondée qu'a donnée A. DUPONT-SOMMER ⁴⁾ de l'ostrakon d'Oxford (*RES* 1793), à une certaine époque la Pâque n'était pas célébrée à date fixe à Eléphantine; on s'en tenait à l'ancienne coutume, attestée encore par le Deutéronome (Deut. xvi 1). Cela n'a rien d'étonnant si l'on songe que la communauté locale d'Eléphantine perpétuait sûrement la tradition d'un Yahwisme pré-deutéronomique, comme le montre l'existence de son temple. Hānaniah n'a pas à y introduire la Pâque, puisqu'on l'y célèbre déjà; mais on règle la date selon le comput sacerdotal.

Peut-être n'est-il pas inutile au sujet de rappeler que ce comput était lié à une „année sacrée”, commençant en Nisan (Ex. xii 1) et

¹⁾ Id. *ibid.* p. 369 s.

²⁾ Position de VAN HOONACKER (*Une communauté judéo-araméenne à Eléphantine, Égypte, aux 6ème et 5ème siècles avant Jésus-Christ*). GINSBERG tient le mot „pâque” pour douteux (dans: PRITCHARD, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, p. 491 A). GRESSMANN (*AOT*² p. 453) lit.: „la fête”.

³⁾ Comme le suggère HENNEQUIN (*DB Supp.* T. 2, col. 999).

⁴⁾ *Sur la fête de Pâque dans les documents araméens d'Eléphantine*, *REJ*, 1946-7, 39 ss.

coïncidant avec l'année babylonienne. Or il semble qu'en 420 les juifs d'Éléphantine usaient encore parfois de l'ancienne „année civile” commençant en Tishri; cette hypothèse, formulée par S. H. HORN et L. H. WOOD, est la seule qui permette d'expliquer la datation du contrat 6 de Brooklyn (KRAELING, p. 191 suiv.) sans y supposer une faute de scribe ¹⁾. En fixant la date de la Pâque, HANANIAH imposait du même coup à ses coreligionnaires l'usage de cette „année sacrée”, qu'ils connaissaient en tant qu'année officielle des satrapies orientales ²⁾, mais qui n'appartenait pas à leurs traditions religieuses les plus anciennes.

B) E. G. KRAELING objecte que, si HANANIAH avait parlé de la Pâque dans sa lettre, il n'aurait pas manqué d'en développer les interdits comme il développait ceux des Azymes ³⁾. Cette considération est entièrement gratuite, et le contraste — très réel — entre la brève mention de la Pâque et les développements consacrés aux Azymes a probablement un autre sens. La lettre n'est pas une série d'avertissements en l'air; elle vise une *situation concrète* qui paraît être la suivante. Les juifs d'Éléphantine célèbrent la Pâque, comme l'attestent les deux ostraka RES 1792 et 1793 ⁴⁾; sur ce point, HANANIAH n'a rien à leur redire, sauf en ce qui concerne la *date* de la fête (introduction d'un calendrier nouveau). En revanche, les pratiques liées à la semaine des Azymes, ou bien sont nouvelles pour eux, ou

¹⁾ HORN and WOOD, *art. cit.* p. 14-16. KRAELING (*op. cit.* p. 194) préfère corriger le texte, ce qui reste bien discutable. HORN et WOOD font remarquer à juste titre que Neh. i 1 & ii 1 suppose une manière identique de compter les années. Or l'usage d'une année commençant en automne paraît également attesté dans plusieurs textes pré-exiliens (A.-G. BARROIS, *Manuel d'Archéologie biblique*, II, p. 178-9). Le recouplement du contrat d'Éléphantine avec Neh. i 1 & ii 1 invite donc à *ne pas* corriger ce dernier texte, comme le font à peu près unanimement les critiques (BATTEN, *ICC*, p. 182, qui cependant fait cette réserve: „unless, as WELLHAUSEN suggests, the year is reckoned after the Syrian fashion as beginning in the autumn”. — RUDOLPH, *HZAT*, p. 102. — GALLING, *ATD*, p. 217. — GELIN, *BJ*, p. 65).

²⁾ Loc. cit. p. 14-15. Le contrat *Brook.* 6 ne contredit pas cette hypothèse puisque, daté du 6 Pharmuthi, 8 Tamouz, l'an 3 de Darius II, il est (de peu) antérieur au papyrus pascal. Il va de soi que, dans ce dernier, „l'an 5 du roi Darius” est à entendre soit à la manière égyptienne (6 Dec. 420-6 Dec. 419), soit à la manière babylonienne (début: le 1 Nisan, 27 Mars 419). Voir le graphique de HORN et WOOD, p. 15. Comme, dans la suite du texte il est question du mois de Nisan, la seconde hypothèse est préférable. Le document ne pouvait donc être mis en application qu'à partir de la Pâque de 418.

³⁾ *Op. cit.* p. 95.

⁴⁾ A. DUPONT-SOMMER, dans l'étude déjà citée, date l'ostrakon de Berlin (RES 1792) du début du 5^{ème} siècle, vers l'époque de COWLEY, *A.P.* 1 (495).

ien sont tombées en désuétude (totalement ou en partie), ou bien ont difficilement; c'est pourquoi Hananiah les rappelle en détail en se révalant de l'autorité royale.

Aucun texte d'Eléphantine ne nous renseigne directement sur le rituel pascal que l'on y observait, mais on peut tenir pour certain qu'il provenait des coutumes ancestrales apportées de Judée par les colons (leur nom de „judéens” exclut une origine israélite). Il n'est donc nullement arbitraire de présumer qu'il coïncidait, pour l'essentiel, avec le rituel archaïque conservé dans Ex. xii 21-23. Ce rituel est certainement pré-deutéronomique et même il contredit le Deutéronome sur plusieurs points importants. Choix du seul petit bétail (21b) alors que Deut. autorise aussi le gros bétail (xvi 2a). Imposition et manducation à domicile (22b) tandis que Deut. réserve ces rites sacrés au seul sanctuaire légal (xvi 2b, 5-6a, 7). Insistance sur la valeur apotropaïque du sang (22a, 23) que Deut. passe sous silence. Aucune allusion aux azymes dans le rituel même de la Pâque, bien que, d'après Ex. xxiii 18 et xxxiv 25, leur manducation ait été associée au repas pascal dès une époque très haute (ces passages semblent généraliser une pratique introduite d'abord dans le repas pascal); dans le récit étiologique auquel le rituel est incorporé, la cuisson des galettes sans levain est placée *après* la sortie d'Égypte (Ex. xii 34 & 39); ainsi la Pâque est encore considérée comme un rite *distinct* de la fête agricole de printemps que Deut., au contraire, lui assimile totalement, au point que le nom de la Pâque y subsiste seul dans la titulature des fêtes (xvi 1).

Or le rituel sacerdotal de la Pâque (Ex. xii 1-14) *se rattache directement au rituel archaïque, en ignorant les innovations du Deutéronome*. Comparer: Ex. xii 3-5 & 21b α (même emploi du verbe לקח); 6 (cf. 11b) & 21b β (verbe שחט); 7 & 22 a-b (même emploi de לקח; P est ici le moins développé); 12-13 & 23 (13: לְמִשְׁחֵיתָ; 23: הַמִּשְׁחֵיתָ). On note spécialement: l'autorisation du seul petit bétail, l'insistance sur la valeur apotropaïque du sang, la manducation de la Pâque dans les maisons (xii 7), l'absence de toute référence au sanctuaire (qui, dans la perspective de l'historien sacerdotal n'est pas encore construit), malgré la désignation d'Israël comme assemblée (קהל) et communauté (עדה). Certes, comparé au rituel ancien, le rituel sacerdotal comporte des précisions nouvelles. Mais, *hormis la question du calendrier, s'agit de points secondaires*. En outre, qui pourrait affirmer à coup sûr que c'étaient là des innovations quand plusieurs d'entre eux figurent ailleurs dans les anciens codes (Ex. xxiii 18 & xxxiv 25: pas de pain

levé, rien de conservé pour le lendemain; cf. xii 8-10). Ne s'agit-il pas plutôt d'une codification raisonnée des coutumes anciennes, effectuée dans un esprit conservateur, malgré plusieurs traits propres à la théologie sacerdotale?

L'indépendance du repas pascal par rapport à la Tente de réunion mérite une mention particulière. En effet, l'historien sacerdotal a introduit dans le fil de son récit *avant* la construction de la Tente les principaux préceptes pratiquables dans la *Diaspora*: Sabbat (Gen. i Ex. xxxi 12-17 est une loi complémentaire dans le style d'Ex. xii 15-20 dont on a vu plus haut la date tardive); interdits noachiques (Gen. ix 1-7); circoncision (Gen. xvii). Ne faut-il pas en dire autant de la Pâque? Même les textes sacerdotaux qui reparlent de la Pâque *après* l'institution de la Tente de réunion et supposent une communauté groupée autour d'elle, restent étrangement muets sur son rôle (Jos. v 10; Nomb. ix 2-5 & 11-12); les plus explicites se contentent de renvoyer à Ex. xii 1-14 (Nomb. ix 3, 11-12). Aucun trait ne saurait mieux accuser le contraste entre la réglementation deutéronomique et la réglementation sacerdotale de la Pâque. L'hypothèse de beaucoup la plus probable est que seule la fusion des deux courants législatifs dans la compilation finale du Pentateuque amena à les expliquer l'un par l'autre. *Jusque là, à s'en tenir aux coutumes sacerdotales, rien n'empêchait que la Pâque fut célébrée dans la Diaspora.*

Si la communauté d'Eléphantine se conformait, en 419, au rite archaïque apporté de Judée, le seul point vraiment important sur lequel ses usages différaient des „lois et coutumes” (Nomb. ix 3) sacerdotales était la *date* de la Pâque. Il n'est donc pas étonnant que Ḥananiah se borne à mentionner cette précision de calendrier. Il n'est pas plus étonnant qu'il autorise la célébration de la Pâque loin de Jérusalem s'il s'en tient à la *seule* tradition sacerdotale, encore *indépendante* du Deutéronome.

3. *La question du temple d'Eléphantine.* Il est certain qu'après 419 les juifs d'Eléphantine ne se conformaient pas au Deutéronome, ne se sentaient pas obligés par l'une de ses prescriptions les plus fondamentales et n'avaient pas conscience de manquer par là à leur devoir. Leur temple était encore debout en 411; un clergé particulier y exerçait des fonctions cultuelles et l'on y offrait même des sacrifices (cf. *A. P.* 30 & 31). Ils se croyaient même tellement bien en règle vis à vis de la plus haute autorité religieuse du judaïsme qu'après le pogrom dont ils furent victimes ils écrivirent en même temps au *peḥa* de Judée Bagohi et „à Yoḥanan et à ses collègues les prêtres de Jérusalem

Ostan frère de 'Anani et aux notables des juifs" (*A.P.* 30 / 18-19). Une telle démarche serait inconcevable si, huit ans plus tôt, la légitimité de leur sanctuaire, de leur clergé et de leur culte, avait été mise en question.

Certes, il faut comprendre, en cette matière, quel était le point de vue des autorités perses. A leur yeux, il n'y avait pas lieu de modifier l'état de fait antérieur à la conquête de l'Égypte par Cambyse (*A.P.* 30 / 13): l'argument de prescription jouait en sa faveur ¹⁾. Les juifs d'Eléphantine le savaient si bien qu'en 407 ils s'appuyèrent sur ce motif pour réclamer la permission de reconstruire leur temple, et le gouverneur Bagohi accéda à leur demande en vertu du même principe (*A.P.* 32 / 3 & 8). L'application du Deutéronome sur ce point précis était donc hors de question. Mais la façon dont „Yadeniah et ses collègues les prêtres de la forteresse de Yeb" (30 / 1) s'adressèrent au grand-prêtre montre à l'évidence qu'ils se croyaient, de bonne foi, rattachés au judaïsme officiel, tout en ignorant la loi de l'unité de sanctuaire. Aussi bien Yoḥanan ne leur répondit-il pas, et ils en conçurent quelque amertume (*A.P.* 30 / 19). *Ḥananiah avait donc imposé à ses religieux certaines réglementations sacerdotales assez sévères sans faire allusion à un point essentiel du Deutéronome.*

Nous sommes beaucoup trop mal renseignés sur sa mission en Égypte pour pouvoir tirer de là un argument décisif. D'ailleurs la place donnée à la *Tente de réunion* dans l'histoire sainte sacerdotale prouve que son — ou ses — rédacteurs n'étaient pas moins attachés au Deutéronome à l'unité de sanctuaire. Il reste que Ḥananiah sous la pression, peut-être, des autorités perses dont il était le mandataire) avait adopté à l'endroit du Temple d'Eléphantine, une attitude étrangement tolérante, qui contraste avec le deutéronomisme rigide d'un Néhémie ²⁾. Sans doute la politique religieuse de la chancellerie s'était-elle modifiée depuis l'avènement de Darius II. Poussant de la faveur personnelle d'Artaxerxès I, Néhémie pouvait se permettre d'entrer en conflit violent avec le *peḥa* de Samarie Anballat, allant jusqu'à chasser de Jérusalem l'un de ses gendres (Neh. xiii 28). En 419, les circonstances étaient différentes. L'envoi de Ḥananiah en Égypte, l'expédition au satrape Arsham d'un firman concernant les juifs d'Eléphantine (*A.P.* 21 / 2), le papyrus pascal

¹⁾ Sur cette politique fondée sur le respect des droits acquis dans les territoires soumis à l'empire perse, voir A. ALT, *Kleine Schriften* II, p. 317 ss.

²⁾ Sur Néhémie et le Deutéronome, cf. H. CAZELLES, *La mission d'Esdras*, VT, 7 (1954) p. 122.

enfin, s'inscrivaient sûrement dans le cadre d'un plan beaucoup plus vaste: en regroupant tous les juifs de l'empire, en uniformisant leur législation et en leur conférant un statut privilégié, la chancellerie cherchait à s'en faire une clientèle sûre. On s'expliquerait bien de la sorte, d'une part, le loyalisme dont firent preuve les juifs d'Éléphantine lors des révoltes qui éclatèrent en 411 pendant l'absence d'Arsham (*A.P.* 27 / 1-2, 10-13; cf. DRIVER, *Aramaic Documents* 5/6 & 7/1); d'autre part les vexations dont ils furent alors victimes. L'hostilité des fidèles de Khnum à leur égard datait du passage de Hananiah en Égypte (*A.P.* 38/7); selon toute vraisemblance, le motif en était *politique*, même si elle se paraît de prétextes *religieux* (*A.P.* 27 / 13-15; cf. le silence de 32/9 sur les sacrifices, confirmé par 33/9-12)¹.

Il est donc possible que, sur le plan de la législation religieuse, la réforme de la communauté d'Éléphantine ait eu un objet très limité, celui que le papyrus nous fait connaître²). Mais le fait que la loi d'

¹) L'hypothèse de CLERMONT-GANNEAU, attribuant à l'immolation des agneaux de Pâque la fureur des adorateurs de Khnum, dieu-bélier, a contre elle; 1) l'attestation de la Pâque à Éléphantine *avant* 419 (or les juifs n'avaient jamais été inquiétés pour cette coutume ancestrale apportée par eux de Judée); 2) l'existence de sacrifices et d'holocaustes (*A.P.* 30/25) pour lesquels les ovins sont mentionnés à côté des bovidés et des caprins (*A.P.* 33/10). Au témoignage d'Hérodote, le culte égyptien lui-même comportait des sacrifices au 5^{ème} siècle, et les Thébains abattaient rituellement un bélier à la fête d'Amon (A. ERMAN, *La religion des Égyptiens*, trad. de H. WILD, Paris 1952, p. 383 ss.). Il reste que l'on pouvait être un prétexte facile à invoquer, surtout si l'on songe à la coulée anti-égyptienne de la *saga* liée au rituel pascal, aussi bien dans l'ancien récit que dans le récit sacerdotal. Le silence de *A.P.* 32/9 sur les sacrifices pourrait donc s'expliquer comme une précaution contre le retour de semblables incidents. Pourtant l'insistance de *A.P.* 33 / 9-12 n'est guère favorable à une telle interprétation. Sans admettre avec E. G. KRAELING (*Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyrus*, p. 107) que le grand-prêtre Yoḥanan était tacitement d'accord avec le *peḥa* Bagohi, expéditeur de *A.P.* 32 (ce qui supposerait de sa part un changement d'attitude après celle que mentionne *A.P.* 30/18-19), j'inclinerais à penser qu'il y avait une *concession* au point de vue du clergé de Jérusalem: Bagohi (appuyé par le samaritain Delayah) s'est arrêté à une *solution de compromis*.

²) Il faut réserver une autre possibilité: Hananiah serait venu à Éléphantine (il parle, dans *A.P.* 21, comme un personnage *connu* qui n'a pas besoin de décliner ses qualités pour donner des ordres); à la suite de difficultés constatées sur place, il aurait envoyé à l'administration centrale une demande d'instructions laquelle répondrait le décret expédié à Arsham (*A.P.* 21/2). Si la grande collection en faveur du temple d'Éléphantine (*A.P.* 22) est en rapport avec l'activité de Hananiah, on doit remarquer que, d'après sa date, elle *peut* être antérieure au papyrus pascal. Le 3 Phamenoth de l'an 5 (de Darius II) tombait le 9 juillet 419. Or l'an 5 compté à la manière babylonienne (comme il est probable dans *A.P.* 22) document émanant d'un fonctionnaire venu d'orient), commençant le 27 Mars 419, se prolongeait bien au delà du 3 Phamenoth. Mais trop d'obscurité entoure ces documents pour qu'on puisse tirer de là une conclusion ferme.

l'unité de sanctuaire ne lui fut pas imposée s'explique mieux si, à cette date, la législation juive était encore *flottante* sur certains points, et notamment si le Deutéronome n'avait pas encore été réuni, dans une synthèse définitive, à la législation sacerdotale. Conclusion d'autant plus plausible qu'une partie de cette dernière (ainsi qu'on l'a vu précédemment) était encore en voie d'élaboration. Cela ne signifie pas, d'ailleurs, qu'à la même époque le Deutéronome n'avait pas valeur de *loi d'état* en Judée¹⁾: l'attitude négative adoptée par le grand-prêtre Yoḥanan dans l'affaire du temple d'Eléphantine est un sérieux indice que, sur ce point, l'action de Néhémie continuait en 411 d'y porter ses fruits. Mais le papyrus pascal montre que, quelques années plus tôt, l'administration perse cherchait à regrouper les juifs en leur donnant un statut juridique puisé à une autre source. Pouvait-elle mener à bout ce projet sans que la législation sacerdotale fût acceptée par Jérusalem? Et Jérusalem pouvait-elle accepter le droit élaboré par les juristes de Babylonie sans que sa tradition juridique propre (Deutéronome et codes plus anciens) fût intégrée à la Loi qui désormais régirait tous les juifs de l'empire? Bientôt sonnerait l'heure des synthèses, c'est à dire l'heure du Pentateuque. A quelle date? La lettre de Ḥananiah permet de répondre: après 419. La supplique d'Eléphantine (*A.P.* 30) suggère: après 407 (permission de reconstruire le temple local). *Entre temps, la dernière étape de la rédaction sacerdotale prendrait place.* Le papyrus pascal a permis d'identifier plusieurs textes qui en proviennent. En partant de ces textes, n'est-il pas possible d'en préciser les caractères et l'étendue? Réserveons à une autre étude la réponse à cette question.

¹⁾ CAZELLES, *art. cit.* p. 131.

“HOSHI‘AH NA” IN PSALM CXVIII 25, — A PRAYER FOR RAIN *

BY

JAKOB J. PETUCHOWSKI

Washington

Whatever our divergent views may be as to the dating of Ps. cxviii and its interpretation as either the psalm of an individual or of the community as a whole, it will be generally admitted that Ps. cxviii is a joyous psalm of *Thanksgiving*.

Confidently the Psalmist exclaims (v. 17): “I shall not die, but I shall live, and recount the deeds of the Lord”. And whoever it is, to whom the ritual has allotted the recitation of verse 24, agrees that “This is the day which the Lord has made; let us rejoice and be glad in it!”

No wonder, then, that a number of commentators should have detected a jarring note in verse 25: *anna YHWH hoshi‘ah na, anna YHWH hašliḥab na*, “Save us, we beseech Thee, O Lord! O Lord we beseech Thee, give us success!” (R.S.V.).

BUTTENWIESER ¹⁾ insists that this verse “. . . is clearly not genuine being contradictory to the rest of the psalm, which is taken up from beginning to end with the wonderful deliverance which God has brought about . . .” BUTTENWIESER, therefore, deletes these words from our Ps.

HANS SCHMIDT ²⁾ speaks about the “surprising change in tone and mood: in place of the hymn—an imploring supplication; in place of the roaring jubilation—words in which there is something of the quiver of fear and terror.” SCHMIDT thinks that the words must have been called forth by something which made the worshipper feel the nearness of God in a very special degree. Perhaps, at this point of the

* A Paper read before the Eighty-ninth Meeting of The Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis at Evanston, Ill., December 1953.

¹⁾ MOSES BUTTENWIESER, *The Psalms*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press 1938, p. 660 f.

²⁾ HANS SCHMIDT, *Die Psalmen (Handbuch zum A.T., ed. EISSFELDT)*, Tübingen 1934, p. 213 f.

liturgy, the heavy gates of the Temple were thrown open, and the worshipper caught his first glance of the sanctuary and the altar. At this point the worshipper could not help uttering some such ejaculation as "O Lord, do Thou bless!"

BAETHGEN, who is sure that this Ps. was first sung at the observance of Tabernacles in the year 444 B.C. ¹⁾, regards our verse as primarily a request for the success of the festive proceedings ²⁾; but he credits the Psalmist with having in mind also a *deeper* meaning of the words, namely: that even though Israel was now protected *vis à vis* external enemies, he was still in need of the continuous protection of God in order to accomplish his high mission.

Determining the precise historical occasion when a Ps. was sung for the first time is a line of investigation which more recent Criticism has done well in leaving alone. Besides, Ps. cxviii is so obviously a compilation of various types of poetry,—we have in it a prayer of thanksgiving as well as the standard liturgical response *hodu le YHWH ki tobh*, and references to different classes of worshippers and ministrants—that it is hard to imagine that this Ps. should have sprung fully fledged into existence *ex nihilo*.

While we must not attach too much importance to the fact, it is suggestive that a number of MSS, consulted by the editors of KITTEL's *Biblia Hebraica* (4th ed.), begin a new Ps. either with verse 25 or verse 26.

To look for a precise point in Biblical History which would account for the words of Ps. cxviii 25 may be a futile task. But, on the other hand, more light may be shed on our problem if we could ascertain the ritual and liturgical setting in which our Ps. is figured. That we are dealing with a liturgical Ps. will be generally conceded.

Apart from GUNKEL ³⁾, who links our Ps. with the bringing of a purely individual *Todah* sacrifice, we have a wide choice of commentators who associate the Ps. with either the *Hanukkah* or the *Sukkoth* festivals.

If we follow the hypothesis which links Ps. cxviii primarily with the *Sukkoth* festival, the words of verse 25 become perfectly intelligible and need no longer be felt as a jarring note in their context.

We may base our hypothesis on the wording of verse 27, which

¹⁾ FRIEDRICH BAETHGEN, *Die Psalmen* (NOWACK's *Handkommentar*), 2nd ed., Göttingen 1897, p. 347.

²⁾ BAETHGEN, *op. cit.*, p. 351.

³⁾ HERMANN GUNKEL, *Die Psalmen*, Göttingen 1926, p. 509.

Associated with the observance of *Sukkoth* was the joyous rite of Water Libation, a description of which is given in Mishnah *Sukkah* iv 9-v 4 and parallel *Tosefta* passages. This rite involved filling a golden flagon with water from the Siloam, and conveying it, among much merry-making, to the Temple premises, where the water was poured into a bowl at the West side of the altar.

All these, and other elements of the Water Libation and the *lulabb* processions around the altar are analyzed by RAPHAEL PATAI in the second chapter of his book *Man and Temple in Ancient Jewish Myth and Ritual* (London 1947).

Dr. PATAI, utilizing the findings of FRAZER and other anthropologists, comes to the conclusion that the various *Sukkoth* rites we have been considering are, or at any rate, were originally, connected with rain-making ceremonies.

Already Rabbi Eliezer, a *Tanna* of the second generation, is reported in the Babylonian Talmud ¹⁾ to have said: "The four species (sc. of the *lulabb*) are used only to procure water. For just as these four species cannot exist without water, so the world cannot exist without water."

And now we may return to verse 25 of Ps. cxviii. We have already seen that it was this verse which was recited during the *lulabb* procession around the altar, once on each of the first six days, and seven times on the seventh day.

But both *lulabb* and Ps. cxviii 25 figure also in another *Sukkoth* observance. Rabbinic law prescribes that the *lulabb* must be shaken towards the four points of the compass, as well as up and down. This custom must have been so firmly rooted that, as the Talmud itself remarks ²⁾, the Mishnah nowhere lays down the law *that* the *lulabb* has to be shaken, but merely raises the question as to the part of the liturgy during which the shaking should take place.

The reference here is to Mishnah *Sukkah* iii 9 ³⁾. Conflicting views are expressed in this Mishnah. The School of Hillel holds that the

¹⁾ *Ta'anith* 2b: א"ר אליעזר הואיל וארבעת מינין הללו אינן באין אלא לרצות על המים וכשם שארבע מינין הללו אי אפשר בהם בלא מים כך אי אפשר לעולם בלא מים.

²⁾ *b. Sukkah* 37b: שיש בו שלשה טפחים כדי לנענע בו כשר וקאמר היכן מנענעין.

³⁾ *Sukkah* 3 : 9: והיכן היו מנענעין? בהודו לה. תחלה וסוף ובאנא השם הושיעה נא דברי בית הלל, ובית שמאי אומרים אף באנא ה' הצליחה נא. אמר רבי עקיבא צופה הייתי ברבן גמליאל ורבי יהושע שכל העם היו מנענעין את לולביהן, והן לא נענעו אלא באנא ה' הושיעה נא.

lulabb should be shaken during the recitation of Ps. cxviii, verses through 4, verse 29, as well as during the words *anna YHWH hoshi'ah na* of verse 25. The School of Shammai wants to see the words *anna YHWH hasliḥab na* included as well.

And then the Mishnah quotes an eye-witness report of Rabbi Akiba, a *Tanna* of the 3rd generation, who says that he had seen Rabban Gamaliel and Rabbi Joshua, both of them *Tannaim* of the 2nd generation, *not* shaking their *lulabbim* when the rest of the people did but only at the words *anna YHWH hoshi'ah na*¹).

Let us briefly summarize our findings thus far:

1) *Sukkoth*, the Feast *par excellence*, was, at the same time, regarded as a season of 'Judgment', when God determined the rainfall of the coming year—, an idea already found in Zechariah, chapter xiv.

2) Whatever the original intention for the use of the plants mentioned in Lev. xxiii 40, in the days of the Second Temple they were definitely used as a festival bouquet during the Temple processions.

3) Both the processions with the *lulabb* and the shaking of the *lulabb* in all directions have the earmarks of rain-making ceremonies: an impression which is confirmed by the rite of the Water Libation observed at the same time.

4) The words *anna YHWH hoshi'ah na* of Ps. cxviii 25 are intimately linked both with the processions and with the shaking of the *lulabb*.

5) According to the practice of Rabban Gamaliel and Rabbi Joshua, the *lulabb* was shaken at these words *exclusively*. It is significant that, according to the Talmud²), Rabbi Joshua was, in his youth himself a member of the Jerusalem Temple Choir. His own practice must therefore reflect authentic Temple practice.

These findings would suggest that the words *anna YHWH hoshi'ah... na* were the prayer for rain, offered up at the Festival of *Sukkoth*.

It is, of course, as a rule, hardly a legitimate procedure to judge from the later liturgical utilization of a given Scripture passage what

¹) ISRAEL LIPSCHUETZ, in his commentary *תפארת ישראל* (ed. Vilna 1912 Vol. II, p. 433), tries to harmonize Akiba's report with the more general practice by saying that Gamaliel and Joshua deviated from the standard practice only to the extent of not shaking their *lulabbim* during the recitation of the words "נא הושיעה נא". But they did shake them during the recitation of the other verses mentioned. However, if we approach the wording of the *Mishnah*, as it stands without any desire for harmonizations, the *Mishnah* can legitimately be taken to mean that the two *Tannaim* in question were shaking their *lulabbim* at no other point of the recitation of the *Hallel* Pss. outside of the words "הושיעה נא".

²) b. 'Arakhin 11 b. For the identification of the R. Joshua, who is mentioned in the *Mishnah*, with the R. Joshua ben Hananiah of 'Arakhin 11 b, cf. H. L. STRACK *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, Engl. transl., Philadelphia 1931, p. 111.

its original meaning may have been. But, as GUNKEL has said ¹⁾, *Ps. cxviii is quite definitely a very late Ps.*, which is proved by the mention of proselytes in verse 4, and its quite obvious quotations from older poems.

Such being the case, the Mishnah, which reflects the views of the *Tannaim*, might well be used as a source of background material when dealing with the ritual of the Second Temple. For, while the compilation of the Mishnah took place around the year 200 C. E., it does contain much earlier traditions.

In fact, as we have seen, some of the teachers who are quoted in the Mishnah have themselves still been participating in the Temple services.

And when details of the Temple ritual are recorded—such as the Atonement Service, or the Bringing of the First Fruits, or, we may add, the ceremonies of *Sukkoth*—there is little ground for doubting the veracity of these traditions.

May we, then, not assume that the rain-making ceremonies were *already* in existence at the time when the liturgy of Ps. cxviii was compiled, and that the words of verse 25 were included on purpose, and with this procession in mind, in the joyous liturgy of thanksgiving?!

Surely, for the people of Palestine an adequate and timely rainfall has always been a question of both *yeshu'ah* and *haṣlahah!*

Only if we understand the words of this verse in the sense here indicated do they fit into the liturgical framework of our Ps. The change of mood from joy to supplication, and back to joy, which characterizes Ps. cxviii, perfectly matches the ambivalent mood of the *Sukkoth* Festival in the days of the Second Temple, as mirrored in the Mishnah.

We can clearly visualize the scene of a general, joyous Thanksgiving, which, at one certain point,—namely: at the procession around the altar,—leads into the supplication for rain, so closely associated with this particular festival, only to revert again, after this procession, to the more general, joyous mood of the *ḥag*.

We may conclude, then, by saying that the words of Ps. cxviii 25, strange at first sight in their context, are easily accounted for when they are regarded as part of the specific *Sukkoth* rites and rain-making ceremonies of which a record is preserved in Tannaitic literature; and that, seen in this light, verse 25 would add weight to the hypothesis which links Ps. cxviii with the *Sukkoth* Festival.

¹⁾ GUNKEL, *loc. cit.*

THE COMPOSITION OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL
SOME COMMENTS ON PROFESSOR GINSBERG'S ARTICLE

BY

H. H. ROWLEY

Manchester

In *Vetus Testamentum* IV, 1954, pp. 246-275, Professor H. L. GINSBERG makes a sustained and intemperate attack on me which compels me to crave space for a brief reply. GINSBERG and I have been friends for so long that I shall try to be more restrained in reply than he has been in attack, since I desire our friendship to continue.

In my presidential address to the Society for Old Testament study, delivered in January 1950, and printed in the *Hebrew Union College Annual* XXIII (not XXXIII, as stated by GINSBERG), Part 1, and in my book *The Servant of the Lord*, I dealt with the problem of the unity of the book of Daniel. GINSBERG says that he was the main target of my attack, and that his monograph was obviously the immediate occasion of my choice of subject. I invite him to turn again to my address, which occupies thirty-two pages in *The Servant of the Lord*. Some six of these pages are devoted to GINSBERG, and he is one of more than a score of authors whose divisive views I review. Over a period of thirty years now I have published articles dealing with problems of the book of Daniel, as well as two books devoted to the same range of problems. Professor GINSBERG can hardly claim that because he had written on the book of Daniel in 1948, it was improper for me to refer to it again, or that there was anything unnatural in my choosing for my presidential address an aspect of the subject in which I have been particularly interested throughout my working life. Had I refrained from mentioning his view, he would have had reason to complain; he has none to complain that I gave it its due place in a review of so many opinions which divide the book in various ways. I gave it no undue space and imported no heat into my references to him that could justify the supposition that he was the main target of my attack. In truth no one was the target of my attack. The reader who reflects that

GINSBERG's reply to my few pages is of about the same length as my whole article will have a better sense of proportion than GINSBERG has been able to maintain.

He writes of my 'jihad' against divisive theories, and my 'phobia' against them. I deplore such language in scholarly discussion. The view which I defended was not original with me, but has long been common amongst scholars of widely different schools. It is to be regretted that GINSBERG should speak of 'ROWLEY's muddleheaded propagandist', and so forth, in his subtle effort to conceal the fact that while his own view is peculiar to himself, mine is not. He says: 'I have proved elsewhere to the satisfaction of anyone who has no mental block against being satisfied...', when all that this unfortunate choice of language means is the modest assertion that he has proved something to his own satisfaction. I greatly regret that *Vetus Testamentum* has sunk to this level of controversy. Let it be remembered that there has been a great variety of divisive theory on the book of Daniel. Of the many such theories put forward GINSBERG rejects all but one, and he is the sole exponent of that view. Why should it be evidence of 'phobia' against divisive views in me that I reject one more of them than does GINSBERG?

He does not hesitate to mislead his readers about my positions in his effort to discredit them. On p. 267 he says that when Jerome speaks of those 'qui in Syria Ptolemaeo favebant', he means by Syria Coele-Syria. No reader would imagine that I had drawn attention to this possibility in my *Darius the Mede*, p. 113 n., in a passage to which GINSBERG refers for what suits him, though I had in fairness added that BOUCHÉ-LECLERCQ took a different view. GINSBERG goes on to add that I adduce three supporting witnesses for Ptolemy VI's kingship over the Seleucid empire, and then points out that this evidence deals with a period twenty years after the time of Antiochus IV. He omits to inform his readers that this is precisely what I said in the passage he referred to, and that that passage was written to correct an imprecise statement of WRIGHT's that Ptolemy VI never sat on the Syrian throne, and had no relevance whatever to the issues between GINSBERG and myself. He pours some scorn on me by drawing some analogy between the afterthoughts I find in the book of Daniel and the 'afterthought' of the tears consequent upon the spanking his imaginary child received (p. 254), when there is nothing even remotely comparable in it. Such afterthoughts as I find in the book of Daniel are clearly there in the present text, and it is not I,

but Professor GINSBERG, who removes them as glosses, and sees in them evidences of a large number of hands. None of all this is scholarly argument, and I much regret that it should find any place in an article in *Vetus Testamentum*.

I do not propose to traverse all Professor GINSBERG's article, but merely to select a few examples of his arguments so that the intelligent reader may judge for himself the nature of the attack made on me. On p. 246 GINSBERG says I have been influenced by subjective factors to the point of imagining a verse which does not exist. This can only give the impression that I have invented something to support my view. He returns to this on p. 251, where he says: 'The phrase "he thought to change times and seasons" occurs neither in ch. ii nor anywhere else in Daniel'. Actually the phrase that occurs in Dan. vii 25 is 'times and the law'—or 'seasons and the law', as GINSBERG prefers to render it. I give this correctly on p. 250 of my book. The imprecise citation on p. 254 in no way serves my view better than the text of Dan. vii 25, and there was nothing whatever tendentious about it, and it is very hard to think that GINSBERG really imagined there was. To suggest, as he does on p. 246 of his article, that this was due to 'anxiety to discover similarities' is misleading.

On the other hand, when GINSBERG changes the text it is deliberately tendentious. He states more than once that Dan. vii contemplates a survival of only the second and third kingdoms after their period of ascendancy, and this is the linch-pin of his whole view. It would be more correct to say that it is only after GINSBERG has altered the text and translation to suit his convenience that his statement is true. He insists on transferring the words at the end of Dan. vii 4 to the following verse, and then renders verse 4: 'its wings were plucked and it was taken from the earth'. He claims that the word נטל cannot mean 'to raise to an erect posture', but can only mean 'to lift, take, take away, carry, or carry away', and in this context can only mean 'to perish'. He rejects my comment that it cannot possibly have this meaning as the verse stands in the Massoretic text, and challenges me to produce one instance of the word with the meaning which almost all translators save himself have always given to it in this verse.

I may observe first that I am not responsible for the form the verse has in the Massoretic text, and that it was given this form long ago at a time when Aramaic was understood at least as well as by

either GINSBERG or me. Aramaic scholars have found no difficulty in the verse until it proved a stumbling-block to GINSBERG's theory, when it was alleged to be impossible to give it any other meaning than the one he desiderates. S. R. DRIVER, in his commentary on *The Book of Daniel*, p. 81, understood the phrase at issue to mean: 'it is lifted up into an erect position.' A century ago MOSES STUART, in his *Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, p. 197, commented: '*It was raised up from the earth as a man*, does not mean that the whole beast was lifted up into the air, but that it stood up on its hinder legs, taking the upright position of a man.' J. A. MONTGOMERY, who can certainly not be accused of any 'phobia' against divisive theories, since he himself advocated one, in his *Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, p. 294, explicitly rejected the view of GINSBERG, which had on this point been earlier held by BEHRMANN.

I may now turn to GINSBERG's challenge to me to produce one instance of the use of נטל with the meaning 'to raise to the (hind) feet, or to an erect position'. He is aware that the Aramaic נטל is frequently used to render the Hebrew נשא. In Ps. vii 7 the Hebrew has the Niph'al of נשא parallel to the verb קום, where *La Bible du Centenaire* and the Jerusalem Bible both render by 'dresse-toi'. In Ps. xciv 2, the same form occurs again in the Hebrew, and here both the translations mentioned have 'lève-toi', while the Revised Standard Version has 'rise up'. In Isa. xxxiii 10 we find the same conjugation, again parallel to קום, and here the Revised Standard Version has "Now I will arise", says the Lord, "now I will lift myself up; now I will be exalted". Here the last words could just as naturally be rendered 'now I will stand up'. The Jerusalem Bible combines the last two clauses to yield 'je vais me dresser de toute ma hauteur'. In all these cases the Niph'al is used with reflexive force. KOEHLER in his *Lexicon* gives the meaning 'rise up' for all of them, and the *Oxford Hebrew Lexicon* cites two of them for the same meaning. In all these cases the Targum uses the reflexive of נטל, which can in every one of them be rendered with perfect appropriateness 'rise to a standing position'. To not one of them can the reflexive or passive of any of the meanings GINSBERG cites as the only possible meanings of the root נטל be given. If the reflexive can mean 'rise to a standing position', there is no reason whatever why the Pe'il, which is a passive formation not found in later Aramaic, should not have the meaning 'be raised to a standing position.'

Lest, however, Professor GINSBERG should not be satisfied with

these examples, I may offer him another, which I hope he will accept as sufficient in itself to meet his challenge to me to cite a single example. In Num. xxiii 24 we have **כִּאֲרִי יִתְנַשֵּׂא** in the Hebrew, and once more the reflexive of **נָטַל** in the Targum. The Revised Standard Version renders the verse 'As a lioness it rises up and as a lion it lifts itself'. This verse clearly refers to a lion raising itself on to its hind legs, and I invite Professor GINSBERG to withdraw his statement that the verb cannot have this meaning. If the reflexive can be used of a lion raising itself to its hind legs in Numbers, there is no reason whatever why the passive should not be used in Daniel of a lion being raised to stand on its hind legs. With the acceptance of this the case for the removal of the end of the verse goes, and the whole case for GINSBERG's hypothesis is gone. He differentiates chapter ii from chapter vii by the claim that his translation here means that the first beast was destroyed before the others, whereas in chapter vii the four parts of the image were destroyed together. If his translation goes, that differentiation goes.

He then points out to me with much triumph and more than once that there was no Babylonian kingdom in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. I readily admit it, and remind him of his own source dictum on p. 271: 'Beyond a certain point it is a mistake to insist upon defining inexact thinking exactly'. An author who cast his story in the form of a dream of an image which was struck on the foot and brought down had to accept the limitations which the form of his story brought. Every detail cannot be pressed, and it is quite idle to do so. GINSBERG agrees that chapter vii comes from the second century, when the Babylonian kingdom no longer existed as a separate kingdom. His only ground for saying that in the vision it was represented as no longer existing is his unjustified exclusion of the natural rendering of verse 4 and elimination of the inconvenient words. If his argument there fails, then there is no reason why chapter ii could not come from the same age. If it shares the same inexactness, that is no proof of different authorship.

I cannot ask for space to traverse his misleading analogies from Pentateuchal criticism, or the many other points in his article which could only be dealt with by wearying the reader. I have said enough to show that his attack is no more convincing in substance than it is satisfactory in form.

A HYMN FROM THE SCROLLS

BY

M. WALLENSTEIN

Manchester

The following is a hymn drawn from the 'Ozar¹⁾. It forms lines 5-15 (inclusive) of plate 39. I have transcribed it, deviating slightly from the transcription made—as a whole well—in the 'Ozar. The division of the chapter into verses is mine. So is the vocalization which is intended to serve as an *additional* commentary to a difficult text. (I fully realize that the hymnologist's pronunciation differed from that of the Masoretes).

This is not the place to assess fully all the hymns, about 35 of which (in whole or in part) are found in the Scroll of the Hymns²⁾. However, even in the following single hymn, small as it is, one may find valuable data, as may be seen from the various notes on the text. A matter which is not readily seen from the notes may conveniently be mentioned here. This Hymn, like the other hymns of the Scrolls, has, broadly speaking, only a little in common with the Hebrew liturgical pieces of the Anonymous Period—most of which seem to have originated in Palestine approximately between the 3rd and the 6th centuries—and still less with the great number of peculiarities in contents, style and structure characteristic of the literature called Piyyut which begins about the end of the 6th century³⁾.

¹⁾ = 'Ozar ba-Megilloth ba-Genuzoth, published by the Bialik Institute and the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1955. It includes: a. Isaiah MS II; b. The War Between the Children etc.; c. The Hymns. Another abbreviation which occurs in this article is: *Ben Sira* = *Sepher Ben Sira ha-Shalem*, ed. M. Z. SEGAL, published by the Bialik Institute, Jerusalem, 1953.

²⁾ Hymns of the same character are found interspersed also in the War Between the Children etc. as well as in the Manual of Discipline.

³⁾ See my article "The Piyyut etc." in the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, vol. XXXIV, no. 2, March 1952.

אוֹדְכָה אֲדוֹנִי
 כִּי לֹא עֲוֹבְתָנִי בְּגוֹרֵי בָעַם
 ... (.)
 (וְלֹא) כְּאֲשַׁמְתִּי שִׁפְטָתִי
 וְלֹא עֲוֹבְתָנִי בְּזִמּוֹת יִצְרִי
 וַתַּעֲזוֹר מִשְׁחַת חַיִּי
 וַתִּתֵּן (אֶת-נַפְשִׁי עֲבָדְכָה) . . .
 בְּתוֹךְ לְבִיָּאִים מוֹעֲדִים לְבִנְיָאֲשָׁמָה
 אֲרִיּוֹת שׁוֹבְרֵי עֶצֶם אֲדִירִים
 וְשׁוֹתֵי דָם גְּבוּרִים
 וַתִּשְׁמָנִי בְּמִגּוֹר עִם דִּיגִים רַבִּים
 פּוֹרְשֵׁי מִכְמֶלֶת עַל-פְּנֵי מַיִם
 וַיִּצְדִּים לְבִנְיָעֻלָּה
 וְשֵׁם לְמִשְׁפֹּט יִסְדָּתִי
 וְסוֹד אֲמַת אֲמַצְתָּה בְּלִבִּי
 וּמִיָּה בְּרוֹת (1) לְדוֹרְשֶׁיהָ
 וַתִּסְגּוֹר פִּי כִפְרִים
 אֲשֶׁר כָּחַרְבַּ שְׁנֵיהֶם
 וּמִלְתָּעוֹתָם פְּחָנִית חֲדָה
 חֲמַת תַּנְיִינִים
 כָּוֶל-מִזְמוֹתָם לְחֲתוֹף (2)
 וַיִּרְבּוּ
 וְלֹא פָצוּ עָלַי פִּיהֶם
 כִּי אֲתָה אֵלַי סִתְרָתִי
 נֶגֶד בְּנֵי-אָדָם
 וַתוֹרֶתְכָה חֲבָתָה (3)
 (עַד קֶץ הַגְּלוּת (4) יִשְׁעֲכָה לִי
 כִּי בְּצָרְתָּ נִפְשִׁי לֹא-עֲוֹבְתָנִי
 וְשׁוֹעֲתִי שְׁמַעְתָּה בְּמִרְוֵרֵי נִפְשִׁי
 וְדִנְתָּ יְגוֹנִי הַכְּרַתָּה בְּאַנְחָתִי 30
 וַתַּצֵּל נַפְשִׁי עָנִי בְּמַעוֹן אֲרִיּוֹת
 אֲשֶׁר שָׁנְנוּ כָּחַרְבַּ לְשׁוֹנָם
 וְאַתָּה אֵלַי סִגְרָתָה (5) בְּעַד שְׁנֵיהֶם (6)
 פֶּן-יִטְרַפוּ נַפְשִׁי עָנִי וְרֶשֶׁת
 וַתוֹסֶפֶת לְשׁוֹנָם כָּחַרְבַּ אֶל-תַּעֲרָה 35
 בְּלִי (הַכּוֹתָהּ) נַפְשִׁי (7) עֲבָדְכָה
 וְלִמְעַן הַגְּבִירְכָה בִּי (8) לִנְגֵד בְּנֵי-אָדָם
 הַפֹּלְתָהּ בְּאֶבְיוֹן
 וַתִּבְיָאָהּ בְּמִצְרָף (9) זָהָב
 בְּמַעֲשֵׂי אֵשׁ 40
 וַיִּכְסֹּף מְוִזְקָךְ בְּכוֹר נִפְחִים
 לְטָהָר שִׁבְעָתַיִם
 וַיִּמְהָרוּ עָלַי רִשְׁעֵי עוֹזִים בְּמִצּוֹקוֹתָם
 וְכֹל חַיּוֹם יִדְכָּאוּ נִפְשִׁי
 וְאַתָּה אֵלַי 45
 תִּשָּׁבֵב (10) סִעָרָה לְדִמְמָה
 וְנִפְשִׁי אֶבְיוֹן פִּלְטָתָה
 מִ(שׁוֹאֲנִים) (11) לְ(טָרָף)
 מִכֶּחָ אֲרִיּוֹת

¹ In the *Ozar* it is transcribed ברית.

² In the original the *war* is erased in parts.

³ In the original part of the *beth* is intact.

⁴ In the original the last three letters are impaired, due to a lacuna.

⁵ In the original the first two letters seem to contain traces of a *shin* and *beth*, the copyist apparently wanting to write שברתה (for which cf. Ps. iii 8). These, however, were inked-over (by the same hand).

⁶ The traces of לשונם are clearly visible here, although erased.

⁷ נפשי seems to have been written originally.

⁸ This word is elevated between its preceding and succeeding words.

⁹ There is here the additional word נפשי (for which cf. Ruth iv 15). There are, however, dots above and below it indicating omission.

¹⁰ The initial letter is not clear enough. In the *Ozar* it is transcribed *kaph*.

¹¹ For this restoration, cf. Ps. civ 21.

TRANSLATION

I thank thee ¹⁾, O Lord ²⁾,
 For thou hast not forsaken me when I dwelt amongst the people ³⁾,
 ... (.....)
 (And thou hast not) meted out to me judgment according to my
 guilt ⁴⁾,
 5 And thou hast not left me to ⁵⁾ the evil devices ⁶⁾ of my impulse ⁷⁾,
 And thou hast delivered my life from ⁸⁾ corruption ⁹⁾.

And thou hast given (the soul of thy servant) ¹⁰⁾
 Amongst lions ¹¹⁾ prepared ¹²⁾ for the guilty men ¹³⁾,

¹⁾ An orthography common in the Scrolls. For a similar instance, cf. Gen. vii 37.

²⁾ This is the usual opening in the hymns of the Scrolls. Once, however, 'Ozar pl. 39, l. 20) אורכה is singled out for omission, by way of dots placed above and below it, and אהה ברך is superposed instead.

³⁾ One is tempted to connect this line with the "Teacher of Righteousness" mentioned in the *Habakkuk Commentary*, pl. LX, col. 11, ll. 4-7, ed. M. BURROWS, New Haven 1950 and elsewhere) who we are told was persecuted by the "Wicked Priest" "in the residence of his exile". SUKENIK ('Ozar, p. 34) would like to see a connection between the "Teacher of Righteousness" and "yea they have banished me from my country as a bird (is banished) from its nest" ('Ozar, pl. 38, ll. 8-10).

⁴⁾ Cf. Ez. xviii 30.

⁵⁾ A similar instance of the use of ... ב is to be found in 2 Ch. xii 5.

⁶⁾ For this meaning of זמות, cf. Is. xxxii 7. Cf. also זמות בליעל ('Ozar, pl. 38, l. 13).

⁷⁾ This meaning given to יצר is common in post-Biblical literature. Ben Sira's ויתנהו ביד יוצר ... ברא אדם ... אלהים "God ... has created man ... and handed him over into the hand of his impulse" (*Ben Sira*, xv 14) and מי יקים על יצרי שון "would that a whip is placed (to hinder) my impulse" (*Ben Sira*, xiii 2) are of interest here.

⁸⁾ For ... מ עור, cf. Ezra viii 22.

⁹⁾ Cf. Jona ii 7.

¹⁰⁾ This restoration, for which the lacuna is big enough in the original, is suggested by l. 36 below. Moreover, נפש is a favourite word with the hymnologist.

¹¹⁾ The one time this word occurs in the plural absolute in the Bible (Ps. lxxvii 5), the pointing is לְבָאִים, although the singular is always pointed לְבִיא (cf., e.g., Ps. xxx 6). The *yodh* after the second radical in our text, which seems to indicate the equivalent of the *hireq*, would therefore appear to be more correct. It is, however, worthy of note that the Syriac seems to have read in Ps. lvii 5 כלבים and the Targum לאבם (= להבים), for it is rendered שלחובין // להטים found in β of this verse.

¹²⁾ Hophal of יעד (Cf. Jer. xxiv 1).

¹³⁾ This expression, not found in the Bible, is common in the Scrolls.

(Amongst) lions capable of breaking the bones ¹⁾ of the strong
10 And drinking the blood ²⁾ of the mighty.

And thou hast placed me ³⁾ in an abode ⁴⁾ together with man
fishermen

Who spread nets upon the face of the water ⁵⁾
As well as with hunters (ready) for the wicked ⁶⁾.

And thou hast established me there for the sake of judgment ⁷⁾
15 And thou hast fortified in my heart the secret of truth ⁸⁾,
And (rendered me as) a well of water ⁹⁾ for those who seek it ¹⁰⁾

And thou hast shut the mouth of the young lions
Whose teeth are like a sword
And whose jaw teeth are like a sharp spear
20 (And as the) poison of dragons ¹¹⁾,

¹⁾ Cf. Is. xxxviii 13.

²⁾ Cf. Ez. xxxix 17.

³⁾ From שים, "to put", the omission of the second radical of which is quite common in the Bible. Cf., e.g., Gen. xxxi 34.

⁴⁾ This noun (from the root גור, "to dwell", on the pattern of מעון) appears in the Bible in the plural. Cf., however, Ps. lv 16.

⁵⁾ A combination of Jer. xvi 16 and Is. xix 8.

⁶⁾ Cf. 2 Sam. iii 34.

⁷⁾ In Jer. xxx 11, of which the hymnologist seems to have been mindful, we read ויסרתך למשפט, "and I will correct thee ...". Similarly is ויסרתך למשפט (Is. xxviii 26). In Hab. i 12, however, we have להוכיח יסדתו ... established him for correction ... thou hast ordained him for judgment ..., established him for correction. Cf. also Ps. cxxii 5.

⁸⁾ סוד followed by various adjectives is a peculiar feature in the Scrolls and especially in the Manual of Discipline.

⁹⁾ = מי בארות (lit., "water of wells"). The strange orthography of the first word is perhaps due to an Aramaic influence and of the second—to the tendency towards the syncopation of the gutturals in the Scrolls. Cf., e.g., Manual of Discipline (ed. BURROWS), pl. v, l. 13, where we have שרית, instead of ארית. Cf. also 1 Ch. xii 38. For the esteem held for wells, cf. Num. xxi 16-18 and Cant. iv 15. See also Damascus Covenant, v 5 (ed. HABERMANN, Jerusalem 1952). The similar idea expressed by the hymnologist is תה אלי שמתה בפי כיורה גשם ... ומבוע מים חיים ... לכל "and thou my God hast put in my mouth rain (which is as welcome) to all as the first rain ... and (as) a fountain of living waters ..." (Ozar, pl. XLII, l. 16). The reading, however, of מי ברית (for which there is no parallel in the Hebrew Bible) or מי ברית (for which, cf. Mal. iii 2 and

מי חטאת, Num. viii 7) can not be ruled out. See note on Heb. text.

¹⁰⁾ Viz., אמת, being, together with סוד, the subject.

¹¹⁾ For the last three lines, cf. Prov. xxx 14; Ps. lvii 5; and Deut. xxxii 33.

(Whose) every device ¹⁾ is bent towards destructions ²⁾.

And they were many,
But did not dare open their mouth against me ³⁾,
For thou, my God, hast sheltered me ⁴⁾

25 From ⁵⁾ the sons of men,

And thou hast enshrined ⁶⁾ thy Law (whithin me ⁷⁾)
Until the time ⁸⁾ of thy salvation is revealed to me ⁹⁾.

For thou hast not forsaken me in the anguish of my soul,
And thou hast heard ¹⁰⁾ my cry in the bitterness of my
soul ¹¹⁾,

30 And the cup of ¹²⁾ my affliction hast thou observed ¹³⁾ through
my groaning ¹⁴⁾.

¹⁾ Instead of the more common מְזוּמָתֵיהֶם. In the Scrolls, however, preference seems to be given to forms such as this. For these forms in the Bible, see BAUER and LEANDER, *Historische Grammatik der Hebräischen Sprache* (Halle 1918-1922), p. 591.

²⁾ Cf. Ps. x 4 (where we have לְהַטִּיף, with a *feh*) and Ps. x 9. Here, however, (and, perhaps, in Job ix 12) it means "to kill", "to destroy". Cf. the Syriac and the Arabic root *hṭp*. It seems to have this sense in Ben Sira xxxii 21. In the apocryphic literature חָתַף is sometimes paralleled with מוֹת.

³⁾ Cf. Ps. xxii 14.

⁴⁾ The piel of סָתַר, which occurs only once in the Bible (Is. xvi 3), is used again in the Hymns. Cf. 'Ozar, pl. XXXIX, l. 26.

⁵⁾ Elliptical for מִנֶּגֶד.

⁶⁾ Qal 2nd per. of חָבַב (with *he* apparently as a *mater lectionis*), "love". My translation, however, is suggested by the contents and by a similar expression, וּבְרוּ חֲבֵתָהּ (cf. 'Ozar pl. 39, l. 25). The meaning given to this root in לִטְמוֹן בְּחִבִּי "to hide in my bosom" (Job xxi 33), is also not far from "enshrine".

However, the reading חֲבֵתָהּ (= חֲבִיתָהּ or חֲבֵאתָהּ) cannot be ruled out. For the plural of חָבַב, cf. Job xxiv 4.

⁷⁾ For this translation, see preceding note as well as note on the Hebrew text.

⁸⁾ Common in the Scrolls and elsewhere in this sense. See my note on it in V.T. IV, 2, pp. 211-213.

⁹⁾ Cf. Is. lvi 1.

¹⁰⁾ The meaning of שָׁמַעְתָּה here seems to be parallel to הִכְרַתָּה of the following line.

¹¹⁾ Cf. Is. xxxviii 15.

¹²⁾ A word of Aramaic origin, the lit. meaning of which is "jar" (Cf., e.g., Bab. Yoma 28b).

¹³⁾ A similar use of הִכְרַתָּה is in 'Ozar, pl. 41, l. 13.

¹⁴⁾ The last sentence, which is original in its wording, is replete with Biblical notions. Cf. e.g. "My groaning is not hid from thee" (Ps. xxxviii 10); "cup of fury . . ."; "cup of trembling" (Is. li 17). "Put thou my tears into thy bottle" (Ps. lvi 9) is of additional interest here.

And thou hast delivered the soul of the humble (while he was) in
the dwelling of lions¹

Who whet their tongues like a sword²),

And thou, my God, hast enveloped their teeth³)

Lest they may devour the soul⁴) of the poor and needy,

35 And thou hast put up⁵) their tongue as a sword (is put up) into
its scabbard⁶),

So that it did not⁷) smite the soul of thy servant.

And in order that thou mayest manifest thy power through me⁸)

Thou hast set apart⁹) the humble one¹⁰),

And thou hast brought him in a refining-pot for gold¹¹),

40 (Yea), into the works of fire.

And (thou hast made him as pure as) silver purified¹²) in the
smith's furnace¹³),

So as to refine it seven fold¹⁴).

And the wicked amongst the mighty have hastened against me¹⁵
with their oppression¹⁶)

¹) See ll. 7-11 above.

²) Cf. Ps. lxiv 4.

³) Cf. Gen. vii 16.

⁴) Cf. Ps. vii 3.

⁵) = וְתָאֲסֶהָ. For a similar instance, cf. Ps. civ 29.

⁶) Cf. Jer. xlvii 6.

⁷) To be taken here as מְבַלִּי, since it is followed by an infinitive.

⁸) This idea, using almost the same wording, repeats itself a number of times in the Hymns. Cf., e.g., 'Ozar pl. 36, l. 24; 38, l. 23. The construction which contains a hiphil intransitive of גָּבַר (found in Mech. Beshallah, 'Amaleq) followed by בִּי is not Biblical and is admittedly strange, but so are numerous other constructions in the Hymns and indeed in the Scrolls in general.

⁹) = הַפְלִיתָ.

¹⁰) Cf. "The Lord hath set apart (הַפְלִיחַ) him that is godly for himself" (Ps. iv 4). The *beth* of בְּאֲבִיחַ, which seems to be superfluous here, may perhaps be due to the common Biblical expression ... בָּחַר בִּי, "to choose", "to select" hence "set apart". L. 38, however, may be elliptical for בְּאֲבִיחַ מְכוּתִיךָ הַפְלִיתָ for which cf. Deut. xxviii 59. The notion expressed here would therefore echo Is. liii 3-6.

¹¹) For this restoration, cf. Is. xl 19.

¹²) Cf. Prov. xvii 3.

¹³) In post Biblical Hebrew נִפַּח is used for "smith". נוֹפְחִים however, may stand for נוֹפְחִים בְּאֵשׁ פָּחַם, for which cf. Is. liv 17.

¹⁴) Cf. Ps. xii 7.

¹⁵) Cf. Ps. lix 4 and note the deviation.

¹⁶) הַצִּקְתָּם, a hiphil verbal noun, would perhaps be here a more fitting word מְצוּקָה implying passivity (Cf., e.g., Ps. xxv 17).

And all the day long they would crush my soul ¹⁾).

45 But thou, my God,

Wilt restore the storm to tranquility ²⁾,

And deliver ³⁾ the soul of the poor

From (those who roar for) prey ⁴⁾,

From the power of lions ⁵⁾).

¹⁾ Cf. Ps. cxliii 3.

²⁾ Cf. Ps. cvii 29.

³⁾ For a similar *perfectum propheticum*, cf. Is. xi 9.

⁴⁾ Namely, the "young lions". See note 10 on the Hebrew text as well as the following note.

⁵⁾ Note the parallel of l. 49 with its preceding line. For מכח אריות, cf. בכח שור (Prov. xiv 4). Cf. also Prov. xxx 30. The reading מכח, however, is obscure in the original and perhaps מכת (= ממכת. Cf. כדור, Is. xxix 3, instead of ככדור), for which cf. Jer. v 6, should be read.

CHRONOLOGICAL DATA IN THE ZADOKITE FRAGMENTS

BY

E. WIESENBERG

London

The close affinity between the Zadokite Fragments (= ZF) and the non-biblical documents among the Dead Sea Scrolls (= DSS) linguistic and ideological, had led to a very nearly unanimous agreement among scholars ¹⁾ that the selfsame sect is reflected in all the documents concerned. Although the DSS contain a great deal of additional information about the sect in question, it is still to the ZF that scholars must turn for chronological data with precise figures. Whilst widely differing among themselves as regards the authenticity of the data in the ZF and DSS or the degree of their historical accuracy, the majority of scholars agree in principle with SCHECHTER's view, in his *ed. pr.* of the ZF, that the crucial phrase בָּקֶץ חֲרוֹן שָׁנִים שְׁלוֹשׁ מֵאוֹת וְתִשְׁעִים לַתִּיּוֹ אוֹתָם בִּיד נְבוּכַדְנֶאצַּר מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל פָּקְדָם in ZF I 5-7 ²⁾ places the rise of the sect concerned 390 years after Israel's delivery into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, i.e. after the destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians in 586 BCE. That view has led a great many scholars to the dating of the sect's migration from Judea to Damascus or its environs, as apparent from numerous references in the ZF, at 196 BCE or some later date in the first or second century BCE or CE; the exact date depending on the degree of the sectarian writer's reliability as regards chronology. That dating led in turn to intricate problems. The affinity between the ZF and the DSS being generally admitted, as also the Judean provenance of the DSS, it seemed necessary either to distinguish somehow the sect reflected in the ZF from that in the DSS or to account for the return of the sect to Judea and to ascertain its date

¹⁾ With the notable exception of E. CAVAIGNAC, *RHR* cxxxviii, 1950, p. 152ff. and G. R. DRIVER, *The Hebrew Scrolls* (London 1951), p. 22.

²⁾ The citations from the ZF are according to the pages and lines in SCHECHTER's *ed. pr.* of the ZF generally followed by later scholars.

circumstances, *etc.* ¹⁾ All attempts at the solution of those problems and the reconstruction of the history of the sect in question, have to face the serious difficulty that the historical sources hitherto accessible seem to be silent about the movements of any Jewish body backward and forward between Judea and the region of Damascus during the period under consideration.

A fundamentally novel interpretation of the ZF has been propounded by Dr. Isaac RABINOWITZ ²⁾ (= R) who claims to have with one stroke eliminated all those problems ³⁾ by rendering לַתִּיּוֹת אֹתָם in the ZF as "at (the time of) His giving them" ⁴⁾. R maintains that neither that phrase nor its context has any bearing whatever on the history of any sect reflected in the ZF, the whole passage referring to nothing else than the history of Israel as recorded in Scripture. The author of the ZF, according to R, reviews biblical history as follows: The divine visitation of Israel in a period of wrath—the time of Israel's delivery into the power of Nebuchadnezzar, *i.e.* the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple in 586 BCE—did not result in Israel's complete annihilation. God "caused to grow from Israel and from Aaron a root of planting to inherit His land"; *i.e.* He saved from the sword a righteous remnant which, as known from Scripture, was exiled to Babylon and ultimately returned from there and reinherited the land. The supposed allusions in the ZF to a sectarian migration to Damascus all refer, according to R, to Israel's exile to Babylon.

As an important result of his novel interpretation, R claims that the ZF passages concerned, "referring to the past history of Israel as recorded in Scripture" and having thus no bearing on the period when the text of the ZF was composed, may be left out of consideration when endeavouring to ascertain the identity of "the Jewish group to whom its author(s) belonged, and its date and locale of composition".

In investigating the 3 chronological data in ZF I 5-7, *ibid.* 9-10 and XX 15, I independently arrived at the same conclusion as R—on the basis of evidence far weightier than that adduced by him—that

¹⁾ Cf. the literature listed in ROWLEY's *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford 1952), p. 78 notes 1 and 2; and in *JBL* LXXIII (1954), p. 11 note 2.

²⁾ *Ibid.* p. 11-35.

³⁾ *Ibid.* p. 13 and 33-34 and note 8b. Further references, except where otherwise indicated, are to the passages just cited.

⁴⁾ R's alternative "to the time of His giving" is somewhat harsh, his definitive "as of His giving" even harsher.

לתיתו אותם must be rendered "when He gave them". The rest of R's thesis, on the other hand, appears to be largely conjectural: his computation of the crucial "390 years"; his interpretation of the other 2 chronological data in the ZF; and his general assumption that the ZF references to events and figures in the past represent real history, of Israel as a whole, not a sectarian interpretation of the past or the history of a sect. Moreover, some of the suppositions entailed in R's thesis are not merely conjectural but also intrinsically improbable.

The purpose of the pages that are now to follow, is to submit to the consideration of scholars a new interpretation of the chronological data concerned. Running to some extent parallel to R's it yet leads to an entirely different conclusion. Leaving aside modern conjectures, it largely rests on notions ascertainable in either Rabbinic or sectarian literature. Although not presenting a ready solution of the problems R claims to have eliminated, it nonetheless offers the possibility of a fresh approach to them. As the first step, an examination of the relevant aspects of R's thesis will now be proceeded to.

R's sole objection to the current rendering of לתיתו אותם as "after He gave them" is the claim that ל never occurs in Hebrew in the temporal meaning 'after', 'from the time that', etc". This claim is not wholly justified. ל occurs quite frequently, in both Biblical and post-biblical Hebrew, in the approximate temporal sense of "after"; witness its use in Biblical Hebrew in the reckoning of the days of the month ¹), in dates reckoned by regnal years or the year of other eras in use—such as the respective Eras of the Exodus ² and the Exile of King Jehoiachin ³)—and in post-biblical Hebrew in dates similarly reckoned by the years of the Hasmonean kings ⁴), the Grecian Era ⁵), the Era of the Creation ⁶) and the Christian era

¹) לחדש. By its side, cf. בחדש in Num. ix 3 and parallels.

²) Ex. xix 1 and parallels.

³) 2 Kings xxv 27 and parallels.

⁴) Cf. Megillath Ta'anith 7, B. T. Rosh haShanah 18b וכך ליוחנן כ"ג 1 Mac. xiii 42 and xiv 27 no doubt imply the same construction in the Hebrew original (ἐπὶ = ל).

⁵) βασιλείας Ἑλληνῶν *ibid.* i. 10 is probably translated from יונים למלכות for which cf. B.T. 'Abodah Zarah 10a.

⁶) ליצירה or לבריאת העולם, first attested *ibid.* 9b and still in common use. Cf. also the eras לחרות ציון and לגאולת ישראל on Jewish coins, as also לבנין הבית and להרבן הבית in Git. viii 5.

current Era¹). In some of the phrases in question—those for dates reckoned after the Exodus (לצאת בני ישראל מארץ מצרים) and the regnal years²), as also the remarkable reckoning in Jer. xli 4 (להמית את גדליה)—the ל is prefixed to the infinitive; the grammatical construction of those phrases thus presenting a close parallel to that of the crucial phrase לתיתו אותם³).

Although the foregoing invalidates R's claim, his objection to the current rendering of לתיתו אותם remains correct. The ל in Hebrew, quite as elusive by its nature as so many other prepositions in so many languages, is well known in a great variety of meanings. Its meaning in any particular passage can, therefore, only be determined by its context. Hence, the current rendering of the crucial phrase ought to be supported by nothing less than an exact parallel to that phrase in that sense. Not one single phrase however, either in Biblical Hebrew or in the whole wide range of the later phases of Hebrew as far as I have been able to ascertain, offers a parallel of that kind. Apart from other peculiarities of the phrase in question⁴), the absence of a preposition at its beginning marks its grammatical construction as distinctly different from that of its aforecited counterparts. "390 years after He had delivered them" would be expressed in Biblical Hebrew with various phrases — בשנת שלוש מאות ותשעים⁵) (בשלוש שנה וגו',⁶) (בשנת שנה וגו',⁷) (לתתו אותם וגו',⁸) (בשלוש מאות שנה ותשעים שנה וגו'⁹) — each of which commences

¹) לנוצרים or למספר הנהוג, in common use in Modern Hebrew.

²) 1 Kings vi 1 and parallels למֶלֶךְ פלוני; by the side of פלוני למֶלֶךְ *ibid.* xv i and parallels, למלכות פלוני 2 Chron. xxxv 19 and לפלוני 1 Kings xv 25 and parallels.

³) The instances of ל in the sense of "after" listed in *BDB* p. 517, *s.v.* ל 6b, present different grammatical constructions and need therefore not be considered here.

⁴) שנים in the plural and placed before the numeral, also in the other two chronological data in ZF I 10 and XX 15—although contrary to common usage in Hebrew, except when due to the emphasis of contrast between one number and another—is possibly modelled on the eschatological passages in Dan. viii 14, *ibid.* ix 24-26 and xii 11-12. The inversion of noun before numeral occurs also in other post-exilic passages: *ibid.* i 12, 14-15, Ezra viii 15, 32, Neh. ii 11, 1 Chron. i 39, 2 Chron. xi 17, *ibid.* xxi 19 and xxix 17. The plural with a numeral above 10 occurs elsewhere only in Ps. xc 4 and Eccl. vi 6 where אֵלֶּף seems to be loosely used in the indefinite sense of "very many".

⁵) Cf. Num. xxxiii 38 and parallels.

⁶) Cf. 2 Chron. xv 10.

⁷) Cf. 1 Kings xvi 8 and parallels.

⁸) Cf. 2 Kings xviii 13 and parallels.

⁹) Cf. 1 Kings vi 1.

with a preposition. The first of the above phrases, the commonest in Biblical Hebrew, is likewise frequent in post-biblical literature. It is attested in an Aramaic version of the Testament of Levi¹)—a *pseudepigraphon* whose affinity with the ZF is well known—in talmudic literature²) and in the stereotype כך וכך למנן פלוני in bills of divorce and other Jewish documents, religious or secular. In the rare instances of such phrases not commencing with prepositions, instances of *accusativus temporis* in stating dates, “after” is expressed by its literal equivalent אחר and not with ל⁴); e.g. ונתנים אחר המבול in Gen. xi 10, the sole biblical instance of that kind⁵) and שנת קצ”ב לאחר חרבן הבית⁶). Alternatively, (ל)אחר may replace other prepositions at the commencement of the phrases in question.

¹) Cf. JQR xx p. 575. It is claimed, *ibid.* pp. 566-9, that that version rests on the Hebrew original and is independent of the extant Greek version.

²) *Vid.* above note 4 on p. 286.

³) The full formula is כך וכך בכך וכך לירח פלוני בשנת כך וכך וגו'. The form בשנת is attested in Tosifta Baba Bathra xi 2, the early codes *Halakhot Pesukoth* (ed. SCHLOSSBERG, Versailles 1896, p. 102) and ALFASI (Venezia 1522 II fol. 600a), as also in the *Tur* and *Shulhan 'Arukh* ('*Ebhen ha'Ezer* 126).

The respective texts in Maimonides' *Hil. Gerushin* iv 2, *ibid.* xi 11 and the digest of R. 'Asher b. Jehiel (*Git.*, Romm-Wilna fol. 113d), seem corrupt. The reliably attested instances of שנת—the stereotype form in the Jewish Aramaic papyri of Assuan and in the recent formulas of bills of divorce since LAMPRON (1679-1756 CE); further attested in a bill of divorce dated at Paris in 1308 CE (cf. BLAU in the Budapest Rabbinerseminar's *Jahresbericht* 1912, pp. 4-5), in private letters at the *geonic* age (cf. *Tesch. Hageonim* ed. HARKAWY, Berlin 1885, p. 32, 235, 278, etc.) for still more abrupt forms of dating cf. *ibid.* p. 156, 179, etc.)—do not represent cases of *accusativus temporis* in dates. שנת is *nomen rectum* of ירח, despite the intervening פלוני, and thus stands for שנת של whose Aramaic equivalent דשנת fact occurs in several early bills of divorce (cf. BLAU, *l. c.*, p. 3, 98 and 100). The interesting form שנת דהוא, apparently modelled on שנת די היא in Ezra vi 11, occurs in *Halakhot Gedoloth* (ed. HILDESHEIMER, Berlin 1888, p. 315). Yet another form to be noted is משנת in an early Karaite bill of divorce (cf. JQR xii, p. 684).

⁴) Ezek. xl 1 presents an instance of אחר in a phrase that does commence with preposition.

⁵) ושלש עשרה שנה מרדו in Gen. xiv 4—another instance of *accus. temp.* in dating cited in GESENIUS-KAUTZSCH (Oxford, 1910) p. 374 3a—is doubtful. The rendering in the ancient versions, with the notable exception of *Targum Onkelos*, may rest on the variant ובשלש in the Samaritan Pentateuch. See also the different interpretation in *Seder 'Olam Rabbah* cited by RASHI *ad loc.* As for עניה ימי in Lam. i 11 according to its rendering in the LXX and by IBN EZRA, *ad loc.*, it belongs to a different category for which *vid.* G-K, *l. c.*, 3b. In the accusatives of יום, יקר, etc., in answer to the question *when?*, *ibid.* 3a, the two categories coalesce.

⁶) *Seder Tannaim wa 'Amoraim*, ed. GROSSBERG (London 1910) p. 66; cf. also the citation in Tos. 'Abodah Zarah 9b s. v. הא'. The variant in *Mahazor Vit* (Nürnberg, 1923) p. 484, is obviously corrupt; cf. HOROWITZ, note 10 *ad loc.*

g. (ל)אחר כך וכך (שנה) לחרבן הבית. If the crucial phrase in the ZF were a counterpart of any of the above phrases, it would read (ל)אחר שלוש... שנה לתיתו אותם or שלוש... שנה (ל)אחר תיתו אותם. At this stage, it behoves to re-examine that phrase within a slightly wider context. The current rendering "And at the time of wrath, 90 years after He had delivered them into the hand of ... Babylon, He remembered them", apparently presupposes the Hebrew original is *וּבְקֶץ חָרוֹן - שָׁנִים... לתיתו אותם ביד... בבל - פָּקֵדָם*; i.e. the main clause is *וּבְקֶץ חָרוֹן פָּקֵדָם* whilst *שָׁנִים etc.* is in apposition to *קֶץ חָרוֹן*. Accordingly, *שָׁנִים* is not preceded by a preposition. It must therefore be an instance of *accusativus temporis* in stating a date; a grammatical construction which, as has just been shown, is without an exact parallel in Hebrew. Attempting to justify the current rendering, one might presuppose the whole phrase under consideration is one continuous clause; i.e. *חָרוֹן*, the *nomen rectum* of *קֶץ*, serving at the same time as the *nomen regens* of *שָׁנִים*. Accordingly, one would find the required preposition in *וּבְקֶץ* at the beginning of the phrase. On that assumption, however, the crucial phrase assumes a new complexion necessitating a fresh start in seeking parallels. There are a number of biblical instances of *קֶץ* in phrases for dates. None of them, however, offers an exact parallel. If the crucial phrase were modelled on any of them, it would read *שָׁנָה... (אחרי) אשר ומקצה חרון שלוש... שנה* (2), or *שָׁנָה... שנה ומקץ חרון שלוש... שנה* (3), or *שָׁנָה... שנה ומקץ חרון שלוש... שנה* (4). Moreover, in all the instances concerned *קֶץ* means "end". Hence, they are out of the question, even as remote counterparts, unless *קֶץ* in the ZF is rendered "end" with SCHECHTER (5); whereas it has long since been recognized that *קֶץ* in the ZF and MSS denotes "period" or "time", in which sense it has also been shown to occur in Rabbinic literature (6). That being so, the crucial phrase in the ZF is without an exact parallel. Hence, R rightly ob-

¹ Or *לבִּרְיָאָה עוֹלָם*; cf. B.T. San. 97b, 'Abodah Zarah 9b.

² Cf. Josh. ix 16, 1 Kings ix 10.

³ Cf. 2 Chron. viii 1.

⁴ Cf. Gen. xvi 3.

⁵ L. c., *ad loc.*

⁶ Cf. WIEDER, *JJS* v (1954), p. 22-31 and the literature cited there. Many of the passages cited by WIEDER have *בְּקֶץ*, the form occurring in the ZF but not in the Bible. It is further to be noted that in some *midrashic* passages (cf. *Pesikta* ed. FRIEDMANN, Vienna 1880, p. 72b note 63) *קִיצִין* appear synonymous with *קִירָסְטִין* = plural of *καρπός* = time. ROWLEY, *l. c.*, p. 71 note 8, and RABIN, *The Zadokite Documents* (1954), p. 2 note 5 *ad* I 5, cite biblical instances of *קֶץ* in that sense. Those are however not quite convincing.

jects to its current rendering. Strangely enough, R apparently retains the current notion that the main clause is **קָץ חֲרוֹן פָּקֶדֶם** and parenthesizes the intervening **שָׁנִים** etc.¹⁾ He thereby greatly impairs the validity of his own thesis that **לְחִיתוֹ** = "at the time of His giving". For on the assumption of **שָׁנִים** etc. in parenthesis, not connected grammatically with **וּבְקָץ חֲרוֹן** before it, **לְחִיתוֹ** is hardly intelligible as either "at (the time of) His giving" or "to (the time of) His giving" or again "as of His giving". As for **לְחִיתוֹ** in the sense of "until (the time of) His giving" (**ל** = **עַד**)—close enough to the sense required by R's thesis and, at the same time, presenting a grammatical construction somewhat less harsh than any of his renderings—it is apparently not considered by R.²⁾ However, R's mentioned manner of parenthesization is not essential for his thesis. The difficulty just mentioned is obviated if the crucial phrase is differently parenthesized; **קָץ חֲרוֹן שָׁנִים שְׁלוֹשׁ מֵאוֹת וַחֲשֵׁשִׁים** **לְחִיתוֹ אוֹתָם בִּיד . . . בָּבֶל**—³⁾ **פָּקֶדֶם**—which is to be rendered "And at the time of 390 years' wrath, when⁴⁾ He delivered them into the hand of . . . Babylon, He remembered them".

The instances of **ל** in the temporal sense of "when" or "at the time of" cited by R, to which one may with equal right add the various constructions listed in the grammar of GESENIUS-KAUTZSCH and in the *BDB lexicon*⁶⁾, are not *exact* parallels to the crucial phrase. There are some phrases however, in the Bible, the DSS and the selfsame ZF, whose grammatical construction is entirely identical with that of the crucial phrase or, at any rate, offers a reasonably close parallel to it. As regards biblical passages, the interpretation attested in the ancient versions, whether or not endorsed by modern exegesis, are obviously of no mean relevance. In 2 Chron. xxxiv

¹⁾ R's assumption that that phrase is an interpolated gloss, although hardly on adequate evidence, need not be discussed here; since, as R himself points out, it does not affect his thesis. The same applies to his rendering of **פָּקֶדֶם** "He visited them" in the sense of punishment, apparently as parallel to **וַיִּתֵּן לְחָרֹב** in Z I 4, departing from SCHECHTER's "He remembered them", **וַיִּזְכֹּר** for good, parallel to the ensuing **וַיִּצְמַח** etc.

²⁾ Nor are the instances listed in *BDB*, p. 517, s. v. **ל** 6e, real parallels.

³⁾ Parenthesis is used here in its conventional, grammatical, sense; not, as in R, to mark off the glosses he labels "DFc".

⁴⁾ "When" is adopted here in order to keep clear of "390 years after" in the current rendering. "After" in the sense of "soon after" is an equally suitable rendering, in several of the passages discussed below and also in the crucial phrase in the ZF.

⁵⁾ P. 351 o.

⁶⁾ P. 514, 5e (b); p. 517, 7b (a) and (b).

Now in the 18th year of his reign, when he had purged the land and the house, he sent Shaphan", **לטהר** and **ובשנת** are the respective counterparts of **לתיור** and **ובקץ** ¹⁾. Similarly, *ibid.* xxxvi 2 = Ezra i 1 must clearly mean "Now in the first year of Cyrus king of Persia, when the word of the Lord ... had been accomplished (= **לכלות**), the Lord stirred up" ²⁾. A similar instance may be seen in **בבאי לשחת את העיר** in Ezek. xliii 3 to be rendered 'as I came at (the time of) the destruction of the city' ³⁾; the **ב** and **ל** in **בבאי** and **לשחת** being the respective counterparts of those two prepositions in **ובקץ** and **לתיור** in the crucial phrase. Lastly, **ובשנה** in **... השנית לבואם אל בית** in Ezra iii 8 is taken in the LXX and Vulgate ⁴⁾ in the sense of "Now in the second year (of Cyrus?), when they came into the house...."; (**לבואם** = **כבואם** or **בבואם**). Instances of this temporal **ל**, a near equivalent of the temporal **ב** and **כ**, are also attested in the ZF's **אל את בריתו לישראל** **הקים** and **בנדר ובחרם ובהון המקדש** ⁵⁾ **לגלות להם נסתרו** **ובענות נפשו לכול** ⁶⁾ **עניי עמ** ⁷⁾ **דוקי אל יטהר בשרו להוות במי נדה ולהתקדש במי דוכ** where the terms

¹⁾ Cf. the paraphrase in the LXX^A and the Vulgate.

²⁾ *Vid.* the cantillation signs in both those passages, RASHI and IBN EZRA *ad* Ezra, *l.c.*, and the LXX of Chron. *l.c.* (μετὰ = after; see above note 4 on p. 290). The different rendering in the English Versions is based on the LXX of Esdras A ii 1 and Esdras B i 1, which is followed in the Vulgate (except, perhaps, in III Esdrae ii 1).

³) That rendering obviates the difficulties raised by "when I came to destroy the city"—cf. the standard commentaries *ad loc.*—and the necessity to emend כנא into כנאו or "כנא, cf. COOKE (ICC) *ad loc.*

⁴⁾ Of Esdras A v 54 = III Esdrae v 56. The different rendering in the LXX and Vulgate of the canonical Book of Ezra, is the basis of the rendering in the English Versions.

^b) III 13-14. All the various renderings of גלות substantially mean "when he revealed". It is the same with ל in לכפר IV 9, לקחת IV 20 and ללכת VIII 8 = XIX 19. The latter may however also be rendered "so as to ...", being as ambiguous as להיות in Gen. xvii 7 and parallels.

c) VI 15-16. **לגוּוֹל**, parallel to the preceding **בְּנֹדֶר** etc., complements **הַטָּמָא**. R unnecessarily varies the phraseology, rendering **לגוּוֹל** "or in respect of robbing" and **בְּנֹדֶר** "because of vow". Although the construction remains somewhat harsh, it is not necessary to emend **לגוּוֹל** into **לְגוּוֹל** with RABIN, *i.e.*, *ad loc.* The other infinitives **וְלִהְבֵּדֵל** and **וְלִהְנוֹר** etc., in the wider context of ZF VI 14-VII 4, are in apposition to **לַעֲשׂוֹת כְּפִרְשׁ הַתּוֹרָה** VI 14 as correctly implied in both R's and RABIN's respective translations.

7) DSD III 8-9. BROWNLEE's rendering of **וְלִהְיוֹת . . . וְלִהְיוֹת** with "so that he may purify . . . and sanctify himself" (*BASOR Suppl. Stud.* 10-12, 1951, p. 12) is somewhat inaccurate, as pointed out by GOTTSTEIN (*VT* 1954, p. 145 note 6). Far less satisfactory however is GOTTSTEIN's own rendering "as though sprinkled . . . and cleaned"; **ל** nowhere occurring in the sense of "as though".

ובענות and ולהתקדש להוות appear to be the respective counterparts of לבקק and לחיות in the ZF.

The foregoing yields substantial evidence, if no irrefutable proof, for R's thesis that the 390 years in the ZF are a period ending with Israel's delivery to Nebuchadnezzar, not commencing with it as according to the current interpretation. Turning to the antecedent of the notion in the ZF, R endorses the view of scholars that the 390 years concerned are an echo of the 390 days, representing years in Ezek. iv 5. In conformance to his thesis, however, he points out that, unlike most modern scholars, the writer of ZF I 5-7 understood the 390 days of Ezekiel not as a reference to the duration of Israel's Exile but, as the scriptural text says, to "the years of their iniquity" which he named a "period of wrath" culminating in divine visitation through Nebuchadnezzar. R's claim appears somewhat dogmatic in that he submits no other evidence for it than his thesis that לחיות in the ZF means "after He had given".

Actually, there is no mean evidence for a part—albeit not the whole—of R's claim. The author of the ZF cannot have interpreted Ezekiel's 390 days in the sense of their interpretation by modern scholars. By Israel's Exile modern scholars mean the Northern Tribes' Exile whose years they assume Ezekiel to have reckoned from the fall of Samaria in 722 BCE whereas the 390 years in the ZF are reckoned, according to their current interpretation, from the fall of Jerusalem in 586 BCE. Belittling the import of that discrepancy ROWLEY points to many of the interpreters of Daniel's 70 weeks who reckoned from starting points other than Daniel's own, viz. the commencement of Jeremiah's 70 years which Daniel re-interpreted as 70 weeks of years¹). That comparison however is not in point. The issue is not a difference between the ZF's and the modern interpretation of a scriptural text; it is a difference between the text interpreted. Modern scholars' interpretation of Ezekiel's figure rests as ROWLEY himself points out²), not on the 390 days in the MT but on the LXX variant of 190 days which they assume to represent the original text. As against this, the 390 years in the ZF, once they are

Nor is his claim correct that DSD polemizes here against the Essene practise of ceremonial baptism. The passage in question only stresses, in line with the *tannaitic* censure on טובל ושרץ בידו (Tos. Ta'anith i 8), that ceremonial baptism *per se*, without an inner purification of the soul, has no value.

¹) *L. c.*, p. 63.

²) *Ibid.*

mitted to echo Ezek. iv 5, evidently presuppose the MT's 390 days in its author's *Vorlage* of that verse. Consequently, the modern interpretation of Ezekiel's 190 days, as according to the LXX variant, is irrelevant to the question of the interpretation of Ezekiel's 390 days by the author of the ZF. In respect to this, ROWLEY's remark that "corruption could well have invaded the Hebrew manuscripts (of Ezekiel) by the time our author (of the ZF) wrote"¹⁾, is beside the point.

Whilst the above confirms R's objection to the current interpretation of the 390 years in the ZF, it does not in the least support his own interpretation of it. On the contrary, R's interpretation raises a whole series of incongruities. In Ezek. iv 5-6 there is mention of two figures, the 390 days (= years) of Northern Israel's iniquity and the 40 days (= years) of Judah's iniquity. Contrary to this, according to R, the 390 years in the ZF are the years of Judah's iniquity. As for the 40 days in Ezekiel, R suggests²⁾ that they are interpreted in ZF XX 13-15 as the 40 years subsequent to the death of the מורה היחיד identified by R with Judas Maccabeus³⁾. Now that presupposes a fantastically extravagant scriptural exegesis on the part of the writer of the ZF. He is supposed to credit Ezekiel with a grasshopper mind; the prophet's 390 days (= years) ending in 586 BCE whilst his 40 days (= years) — according to the scriptural context, simultaneous with the former or an immediate sequel to them—are supposed to commence, more than 4 centuries later, in 160 BCE. The evidence for that presupposition is nil, as the phraseology in ZF XX 13-15 is not at all reminiscent of the 40 days in Ezekiel but rather of the 40 years of Israel's wandering in the wilderness⁴⁾.

True enough, R assumes that the writer of the ZF himself⁵⁾ indulges in sudden darts from date to date; which is quite in line with what R presumes him to presuppose on the part of Ezekiel. The 390 years in ZF I 5-8 end with the fall of Jerusalem in 586 BCE according to R, whilst he assumes⁶⁾ that the 20 years in I 9-10—striking the unwary reader as an immediate sequel to the mentioned

¹⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 64.

²⁾ Note 34.

³⁾ Note 116.

⁴⁾ Cf. Dt. ii 14 where the scriptural text has 38 years. For the 40 years of the whole period in the wilderness, *vid.* Ex. xvi 35 and parallels.

⁵⁾ As regards that incongruity, it makes little difference whether he is the author of the ZF *in toto* or, as R maintains, a late glossator.

⁶⁾ Notes 11 and 13.

390 years of wrath—end with the rise of Nehemiah as a Teacher of Righteousness ¹). R thus presupposes the writer to by-pass, in a bold leap, not only the blanks of indeterminate length in the Persian phase of Jewish history ²) but also the 70 years of the Babylonian Exile which that writer, apparently quite familiar with his Bible, is hardly likely to have been unaware of. The assumption of consistency of that kind however, consistency in incongruity, rather weakens R's thesis than favours it.

It is only fair to admit that the interpretation of the 390 years by R, in no way depends on that of the 20 and 40 years. Rejecting the latter, one might still retain the former. Yet the initial objection to it remains. Moreover, R's computation of the very 390 years is based on propositions entailing additional incongruities of a similar nature. R states that the 390 years' period of wrath is a period *immediately prior* ³) to the "visitation" through Nebuchadnezzar. Its precise *terminus ad quem*, as indicated in ZF I 3-4, is the year of the destruction of Solomon's Temple, the eleventh year of Zedekiah's reign (2 Kings xxv 2 f., Jer. lii 5 f., 2 Chron. xxxvi 11-20). A *terminus a quo* is also indicated, in ZF VII 12-14; it is "when the two houses of Israel separated", *i.e.* at the beginning of Rehoboam's reign (1 Kings xii 16 f., 2 Chron. x 16 f.). Although the regnal years from the beginning of Rehoboam's reign to Zedekiah's eleventh year total 393, not 390, the 3-year difference is accounted for by the subtraction of 3 years of "godliness" in which the tribes of Israel and their king Rehoboam walked in the way of David and Solomon as stated in 2 Chron. xi 16-17. Hence, the ZF's 390 years' wrath = years of Israel's iniquity in Ezek. iv 5, began in Rehoboam's fourth year and culminated in Zedekiah's eleventh year when Nebuchadnezzar destroyed the Temple of Solomon. R's computation, of which the above is a fair summary, is open to the following objections:

a) The *terminus a quo* of the 390 years' wrath is not indicated in ZF VII 12-14. That text, according to R, is the commencement of:

¹) Is it the assumption of a discrepancy between the dates in Neh. i 1 and *ibid.* ii 1—*cf.* the standard commentaries *ad loc.*—that led R to the supposition of the entirely unfounded notion on the part of his glossator that ZF I 8-9 alludes to the 20 years (actually "20th year") in Neh. i 1?

²) As well known, the commencement of Nehemiah's activities is variously placed by historians in the 20th year of Artaxerxes I (444 BCE) or of Artaxerxes II (385 BCE). Also according to the chronology in Seder 'Olam Rabbah 30 = B.T. 'Abodah Zarah 8b-9a, where the whole Persian phase shrinks to 52 years, it is apparently set no less than 38 years after the Edict of Cyrus.

³) R's italics. "Immediately", as will be seen below, is of crucial importance

ng gloss, interpolated in the earlier stratum, extending to VIII 2¹). The supposed earlier stratum VII 9-12 and VIII 2-3 predicts for the time of the final divine visitation of the land, as correctly stated by himself²), the fulfilment of the prophecy in Isa. vii 17 and is rendered by R "and as for all who reject, during God's visitation of the land the recompense of the wicked is to recoil upon them³) through the coming (to pass) of the word which is written among the words of Isaiah son of Amoz, the prophet, as it is said: 'He shall bring⁴) upon thee and upon thy people and upon thy father's house days which have (not⁵)) come from the day that Ephraim departed from Judah'⁶), that is the day when God shall visit . . .". The supposed later stratum VII 12 ff., setting in as an explanatory comment on the quotation from Isaiah, is rendered by R "When the two houses of Israel separated, Ephraim departed from Judah; now as for all backsliders, they were delivered up to the sword, but those who held fast escaped to the land of the north". Stating that "Ephraim departed from Judah" alludes to 1 Kings xii 16-17 = 2 Chron. x 6-17, R claims⁷) that, to the writer of his supposed *glossa glossematis*,

¹) If I understand him aright, R assumes—cf. his *Quellenscheidung* in Note 8a—that the gloss in question is a gloss within a gloss; VII 12-VIII 2 being interpolated in V 17-VIII 3 which itself is an interpolation in the original of the Admonition" stratum of Text A of the ZF. Within V 17-VIII 3—labelled by R once "DFc" to distinguish from the original Admonition stratum (= DFa) and once "MS A1" to distinguish from the *halakhic* stratum (= MS A2) in Text A—there is further embedded VII 6-9 which belongs to the stratum MS A2. Whatever his justification for that subtle analysis, R might have spared his readers some unnecessary headaches. On p. 24 and in notes 77 and 79 he labels ZF VII ff. as "A1 VII 9 ff."—thereby inducing his readers to distinguish it from ZF VII 6-9 labelled "A VII 5-6" (actually mislabelled "A VII 6")—whereas according to his own *Quellenscheidung* both passages belong to the same stratum (*i.e.* MS A1 as distinct from MS A2; *alias* DFc as distinct from DFa; and why not DFc1 in further distinction from DFc2 = ZF VII 12-VIII 2 which he supposes to be a gloss within a gloss?). The tantalizing "DFh" and "DFc(h)" in notes 51 and 55 are possibly just different labels for "MS A2" and "DFc atque MS A2" respectively. But one cannot be sure.

²) Note 28.

³) R correctly states, note 77a, that the facsimiles of the ZF show להשיב, not להשיח as in Rosr's transcription. The text nonetheless remains harsh. It is perhaps better to adopt the emendation suggested by RABIN, *i.e.*, note 2 *ad* VII 9.

⁴) R, note 80, emends the text's בוא into ביא as in MT. Cf. however RABIN, *ibid.*, note 2 *ad* VII 11.

⁵) R, note 81, endorses the usual emendation of באו into לא באו.

⁶) R's translation not extending to VIII 2-15, I can only hope that it would not essentially differ from my above rendering of a small part of the tailpiece of his supposed DFc1.

⁷) Note 83.

"that is the beginning of the 390 years' 'period of wrath' which culminated in the 'ancient' visitation". In the light of the preceding his claim is seen based on a drastic change in the text of the ZF ¹⁾ and also on a subtle *Quellenscheidung* which, at its best, is but an hypothesis. Moreover, R's claim is incompatible with the plain sense of his own rendering. "N O W . . . they were delivered up" is supposed to mean "T H E N — viz. 390 years later—they were delivered up" which presupposes once again that the writer is out to fool his reader by darting in a sudden leap from the commencement of the "period of wrath" to its end.

The text with its corrections, whether or not R's analysis of strata be accepted, seems to indicate that the two phrases "At the separation of 'the two houses of Israel' " and "Ephraim departed from Judah" ²⁾ adapted from Isa. viii 14 and vii 17 respectively, are used by the writer in the sense of an event simultaneous, if not synonymous with what he describes with the words "And all (in Ephraim?) who turned back (to Judah?) were given over to the sword, but those (in Ephraim?) who held fast escaped to the land of the north". Accordingly, "the two houses of Israel" stand not for Ephraim and Judah but for two sections in Ephraim ³⁾ whose departure from Judah is apparently quite approved of by the writer ⁴⁾.

Whilst it can certainly not be claimed that that exceedingly obscure passage is satisfactorily elucidated by the above interpretation ⁵⁾

¹⁾ *Vid. supra*, note 5. on p. 295.

²⁾ Or, possibly, "Ephraim became ruler above Judah"; cf. RABIN, *l.c.*, note ad VII 13. Another alternative might be "E became ruler, Judah trespassed" (מעל); an allusion to במעלם in I 3.

³⁾ Cf. Targum and RASHI on Isa. viii 14.

⁴⁾ The homiletical use of יהודה מעל אפרים — although obviously at variance with Isa. vii 17 which clearly alludes to the division of the kingdom as described in 1 Kings xii 16-17 = 2 Chron. x 16-17—pales into insignificance in comparison with the use of Amos v 26-27 in ZF VII 14-18, that interpretation of objects of idolatry as objects of legitimate reverence which transcends the hitherto known limits of homiletics.

⁵⁾ Retaining the text as it stands, with its Isaiah quotation's divergences from the MT, one might perhaps render ZF VII 9-14 as follows: "Upon all who rejected, during God's visitation of the land, the recompense of the wicked is to recoil when the word comes to pass which is written among the words of Isaiah . . . as it is said 'There shall come upon thee . . . days (of evil)', which came after the day of Ephraim's departure from Judah. At the separation of the two houses of Israel, Ephraim became ruler, Judah trespassed, and all in Ephraim who turned back to Judah were given over to the sword, but those in Ephraim who held fast escaped to the land of the north".

that passage evidently contains, even according to R's interpretations of it, no indication that the writer looked upon Ephraim's departure from Judah as the beginning of the period of wrath he or some other glossator mentions elsewhere in the ZF, which—on R's own admission—commenced 3 years later than the division of the kingdom.

b) The period from Rehoboam's fourth year to Zedekiah's eleventh year is, notwithstanding 2 Chron. xi 16-17, hardly an unrelieved "period of wrath" = "years of iniquity". If, as R maintains, the author(s) of the ZF derived his (their) information from Chronicles he (they) could hardly fail to note the biblical approval, in parts at any rate, of the reigns of Judean kings like Asa, Jehoshaphat, Joash, Amaziah, Uzziah, Jotham, Hezekiah and Josiah.

c) The computation of the mentioned period as 390 years, presupposes rather shallow acquaintance with biblical chronology. True enough, the regnal years of the Judean kings from Rehoboam to Zedekiah total 393. It must be recognized however, except by ignoring entirely the problems raised by the synchronization in Kings and Chronicles of Israelite and Judean regnal years, that some of those years overlap; the first and last year of every king being but a fragment of a year. It is axiomatic in talmudic literature¹⁾ that the First Temple, built in Solomon's fourth year (1 Kings vi 1 = 2 Chron. iii 2), stood 410 years. The regnal years from Solomon's fourth to Zedekiah's eleventh year total 430. Evidently, 20 years—roughly corresponding with the number of the Judean kings—are subtracted from that total. Admittedly, more than that adjustment is required for a satisfactory solution of the numerous intricate problems connected with biblical chronology. Disregard for even that adjustment, however, entails a palpably wrong chronological notion on the part of the writer(s) of the ZF.

In view of the foregoing, R's thesis as a whole is found wanting. Some elements in it, however, rest on a firm foundation: **לתינו אותם** in the ZF must be rendered with R "when He delivered them". The 390 years' wrath, an echo of the 390 days in Ezek. iv 5, are prior to Israel's delivery to Nebuchadnezzar, "the years of iniquity" in the scriptural text being taken in a literal sense as assumed by R. In departure from R's thesis, on the other hand, the period of wrath is not *immediately* prior to Nebuchadnezzar; nor is its beginning the division of the kingdom at Rehoboam's accession. The notion in the

¹⁾ Cf. Tos. Zeb. xiii 6 and parallels.

ZF of 390 years' wrath has its counterpart in an old Rabbinic interpretation of Ezek. iv 4-5 according to its MT—the text read by the author of the ZF, as has been seen—that counters modern scholars' reasoning for the superiority of the LXX variant. Their reasoning may be briefly summarised as follows: Ezekiel seems to set forth, in a series of dramatic symbols, the fate of Jerusalem and of the Hebrew nation; representing simultaneously the siege of the city and the exile of the two branches of the nation, and fixing Judah's exile at 40 years—a round figure for the Babylonian captivity—and Northern Israel's at 390 years in the MT but 190 years in some LXX manuscripts. Since Samaria fell about 150 years before Jerusalem, and since Israel's exile was apparently assumed to end simultaneously with Judah's, the LXX figure must represent the original text¹). All that reasoning rests on the presupposition that Ezekiel's 390 and 40 days do in fact represent the respective periods of Israel's and Judah's exile. If—for whatever reason²)—that presupposition is not accepted, the edifice collapses. Now according to their Rabbinic interpretation, in agreement with the literal sense of שְׁנֵי עֶנְיָם in the biblical text R so rightly draws attention to, Ezekiel's figures represent not years of exile but years of iniquity. On the basis of an elaborate calculation, into whose involved details it is not necessary to enter here, the intermittent periods of disloyalty from the conquest of Canaan till the fall of Samaria, on the part of the entire nation or of Northern Israel, are computed to total 390 years: the years of “the iniquity of the house of Israel”. Further periods of disloyalty from the fall of Samaria till the fall of Jerusalem, on the part of unchastised Judah, are computed to total 40 years: the years of “the iniquity of the house of Judah”. Thus, the 390 and 40 years are not simultaneous periods of exile but successive periods of iniquity³) prior to the exile.

It is not intended here to press for a reversal of the modern preference for the LXX variant⁴). It is only claimed that if the author

¹) Cf. the standard commentaries *ad loc.*

²) It is, *inter alia*, to be objected to it that the Babylonian exile is invariably fixed in the Bible at 70, not 40 years (cf. Jer. xxix 10 and parallels).

³) It is worth noting that the two figures total 430 years, *i. e.* just above 8 and a half jubilee cycles. There being 8 years of rest in each jubilee cycle—the 7 sabbatical years plus the jubilee year (cf. Lev. xxv 1-14)—close on 70 years of rest were unobserved in the periods of Israel's and Judah's disloyalty, which agrees with the 70 years of the Babylonian Exile presented as atonement for the non-observance of the years of rest (cf. Lev. xxvi 34-35, 2 Chron. xxxvi 21).

⁴) The divergence between the MT and LXX may well be a case, not without parallels elsewhere, of a difference between Palestinian and Alexandrian exegesis

of the ZF understood Ezek. iv 5-6 in the above sense—an assumption reasonable enough as justice is done thereby to the MT, *i.e.* his text, of that passage ¹⁾—his 390 years' wrath will be seen to culminate in Northern Israel's exile. At the first glance, that seems incompatible with his description of it as Israel's delivery into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar. In the light of what history knows of that king's contacts with Israel, the delivery into his hand must needs be—as in fact all scholars, including R, assume it to be—no other event than the fall of Jerusalem. That objection, however, is more apparent than real. The writer of the ZF may well refer not to the historical Nebuchadnezzar but to the Nebuchadnezzar of fable and fancy. In the Book of Judith, for instance, whose date of composition is usually placed in the age of the Maccabees, one reads, as well known, about an anachronistic Nebuchadnezzar, king of Assyria, dispatching a punitive expedition against the Jews recently returned from the exile. Anachronistic deviation in the opposite direction may be seen in the *aggadic* tales about Nebuchadnezzar's escape—some 60 or 70 years before the likely date of his birth—from the disaster of Sennacherib's army at the siege of Jerusalem ²⁾ or his re-drafting of the letter of congratulations from his master Merodach-Baladan to Hezekiah ³⁾. Other records of events during the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, are met with in Samaritan reports about the exile of the northern tribes, *i.e.* the Samaritans. According to one report ⁴⁾, Nebuchadnezzar exiled them, with their king Hosea the son of Elah, during the pontificate of the Samaritan highpriest 'Aḳabiah. Another report ⁵⁾ makes that exile nearly simultaneous with Nebuchadnezzar's destruct-

already reflected in variants of the biblical text. A compromise is apparently aimed at in the Targum of Ezek. iv 5 where the 390 days in the MT—שְׁנֵי עֹנָם—being rendered על חד תרין כחוביהן—seem to stand for the northern tribes' 195 years of exile.

¹⁾ Nor is the assumption to be objected to, on chronological grounds, as incompatible with the date of composition of the ZF, that the said Rabbinic interpretation of Ezekiel's figure is reflected therein. Although first recorded in Seder 'Olam Rabbah, a chronological treatise traditionally ascribed to the *Tanna* R. Jose b. Ḥalafta of the 2nd century CE, whence it is quoted by RASHI and QIMḤI, *ad loc.* and Pseudo-Rashi *ad* 2 Chron. xxxvi 21, the said interpretation is likely to date from a far earlier age. Also the date of composition of the ZF is altogether uncertain; witness the wide divergence of views on the subject.

²⁾ B.T. Sanh. 95b.

³⁾ *Ibid.* 96a, *cf.* 2 Kings xx 12.

⁴⁾ NEUBAUER, "El Tholidoth", *Journal Asiatique*, 1869, p. 401.

⁵⁾ Abu'l-Faṭḥ, ed. VILMAR (Gotha 1865), p. 55 ff.

ion of Jerusalem. A third report ¹⁾ knows of two such exiles: the first by Shalmaneser during the pontificate of the mentioned 'Akabiah; the second by Nebuchadnezzar, some time after his destruction of Jerusalem, during the pontificate of 'Azariah.

That kind of free and easy unconcern for chronology, extant in works ranging from the Book of Judith to the late Samaritan chronicles, may well originate in early traditions of uncertain dates ²⁾. There is no evidence for any greater concern for, or better knowledge of, accurate chronology in the ZF. It is therefore by no means necessary to assume that Israel's delivery to Nebuchadnezzar in the ZF stands for the fall of Jerusalem, the name of which city is significantly enough nowhere mentioned in the ZF. It may equally stand for the fall of Samaria or some other calamity, real or imaginary, inflicted by Nebuchadnezzar on some remnants of the northern tribes. If history knows nothing at all of contacts of that kind between Nebuchadnezzar and the northern tribes, *tant pis* for history.

Whatever event and date be alluded to, the ZF appear to present the claim of a sect to have been chosen and saved when the rest of Israel was engulfed by the Babylonian (?) exile. The selfsame claim—in a way the *raison d'être* of the ZF—is repeated time and again in the ZF. After a survey of history stretching from the antediluvian age to the exile—the fall of the angelic Watchers of Heaven, the depravity of the sons of Noah, the faithfulness of the patriarchs, the depravity of the sons of Jacob, their descendants' stubbornness in Egypt, their disobedience in the wilderness, and the dire fate of their later generations, their kings and mighty men—it is stated again in III 10-13 "... their land became desolate ... and they were given over to the sword ... but with their remnant that held fast to His commandments God established His covenant with Israel ...". After another retrospect to the myth of an ancient contest between Good and Evil at the time of Israel's first salvation when Moses and Aaron raised up by the Prince of Light were opposed by Belial's evil lieutenants Jannes and his brother, it is claimed again in V 20-VI 5 that the sect was elected at a similar turning point in history, "at the time of the destruction of the land" when "the removers of the landmark arose and led Israel astray and the land became desolate ... and God remembered the forefathers' covenant and raised from Aaron men of

¹⁾ ADLER-SELIGSOHN, "Chronique Samaritaine", *REJ* XLIV, p. 214 and 216-17.

²⁾ Quite as uncertain as the date of composition of the ZF; cf. above note 1 on p. 299.

understanding and from Israel men of wisdom ... who went out from the land of Judah and sojourned in the land of Damascus ...". R rightly points out ¹⁾ that **וּבִקֵּץ חֶרֶבן הָאָרֶץ** in V 20, of crucial importance as the temporal context of the migration to Damascus in VI 5, refers to the same event as **וּבִקֵּץ חֶרֶן** in I 5. The reference, however, is not to the Exile to Babylon in 586 BCE but, as already stated, to some obscure event, real or imaginary, in the history of a sect claiming to be the Remnant of (Northern) Israel as distinct from Judah whom it assumes doomed to destruction. The sect's dissociation from Judah is stated clearly enough in IV 10-11 "the period having been completed, according to the number of these years ²⁾, there shall be no more uniting ³⁾ with the house of Judah". In the cryptic passage VII 12-14 ⁴⁾ Ephraim's departure from Judah is the temporal context of the backsliders' delivery to the sword and the faithful Remnant's escape to "the land of the north". That geographical term, as correctly stated by R ⁵⁾, is equivalent to the land of Damascus where the sect claims to have received a new revelation. Whilst its designations as "the digging of the well" in III 15 and VI 3 and "the new covenant in the land of Damascus" in VI 19, VIII 21 and XX 12, being but nondescript adaptations of biblical phrases, offer *per se* no obstacle to R's interpretation ⁶⁾ of the new revelation as the covenant of the whole of exilic and post-exilic Israel ⁷⁾, its contents decidedly mark it as sectarian. It is claimed in III 12-15 that with the faithful Remnant "God established his

¹⁾ Note 38.

²⁾ The reference, as also **עַד שְׁלִים הַקֶּץ הַשְּׁנִימ הָאֵלֶּה** in IV 8-9, is probably to the completion of the 390 years of wrath.

³⁾ RABIN, *l.c.*, note 1 *ad* IV 11, suggests that **לְהַשְׁתַּפַּח**, with **ש** instead of **ס**, is a pun on "smite with scab" (Isa. iii 17). If so it may well be a defiant retort to Jewish contempt of the sect's peripheral Judaism, reminiscent of **קָשִׁים גָּרִים** **לְיִשְׂרָאֵל כִּסְפָּחַת** (Kid. 70b). Whether or not the peculiar spelling is intentional, **הַסְתַּפַּח ב** in 1 Sam. xxvi 19 is no exact parallel to the phrase. Without any support in the text is R's interpretation, notes 36 and 37, that "it will no longer be necessary for Israel to remain concentrated in Judea, but they may spread abroad to teach the gentiles the knowledge of the Lord". Nor is that notion, *pace* R, in accordance with prophetic teaching. The scriptural passages, of which he cites an impressive list, deal partly with traffic in the opposite direction—gentile converts streaming to Judea—partly with Israel's re-possession of her ancestral heritage, and partly with with her conquest of adjacent lands.

⁴⁾ *Cf.* above p. 296 and note 5 *ibid.*

⁵⁾ Note 86.

⁶⁾ *Passim*, especially notes 15, 96 and 125.

⁷⁾ *Pace* R, note 15, the scriptural prototype of the "passing into the new covenant" in DSD ii 19 ff. and ZF XIV 3 ff. is Dt. xxvii 11 ff. and *ibid.* xxix 9 ff. rather than Neh. ix-x.

eternal covenant with Israel by revealing to them hidden things concerning which all Israel had gone astray: His holy Sabbaths and His glorious appointed times, His righteous testimonies and His true ways and the requirements of His desire which man shall do and live thereby". The rejecters of that revelation are not the Hellenizers, as assumed by R¹⁾, but, as already seen by SCHECHTER²⁾, the bulk of the Jews who refused the Book of Jubilees' and ZF's notions of "Sabbath and appointed times" and claimed to be themselves in the possession of the true Torah³⁾. The condemnation in IV 20-V 1 of polygamy as whoredom, the slur in V 2-6 on David⁴⁾ and the proof by analogy in V 8-11 that marriage between uncle and niece is incestuous—a point actually on record in sectarian literature⁵⁾ and said to have been held by the ancient Sadducees⁶⁾—are still clearer instances of hostility not so much by conservative Jews to Hellenizers, as by sectarians, possibly under gnostic influence, to Jews and Judaism.

R is probably right in assuming⁷⁾ that the fountainhead of the *halakhic* notions in the ZF is the "Searcher of the Law" in VI 7 and VII 18 = the מחוקק⁸⁾ in VI 7 = the "Star" in VII 18. He is evidently the chief leader of the migrants to Damascus. In V 20-VI 11 he is placed in "the period of the land's devastation", in VII 10-VIII 1 in that of "Ephraim's departure from Judah". Unless those passages present two mutually incompatible traditions inadvertently combined in the ZF, they refer to one and the same event apparently assumed to have occurred in the reign of Nebuchadnezzar. Owing to uncertainty on

¹⁾ Notes 48, 57, 93, 109, 112 and 122.

²⁾ *L. c.*, p. xvi-xxi and xxviii-xxix.

³⁾ Cf. III 19 **לנו היא** **ו'אמר** כי, probably adapted from Ezek. xi 15 and also reminiscent of Gen. xxvi 20.

⁴⁾ R, note 48, names it an "apology for David" and a "rebuttal of arguments for the justification of Hellenizing practices", which is quite in line with the discovery of allusions to the Davidic Messiah in the ZF by R's *tour de force* in notes 94 and 95.

⁵⁾ For the Samaritans, cf. KIRCHHEIM, *Karme Shomeron*, p. 28; WRESCHNER, *Samaritanische Traditionen*, p. 14; GEIGER, *ZDMG* xx, p. 557. For the Abu 'Imran sect, cf. HADASI, *Eshkol haKopher*, ALPH. 98. For the Karaites, cf. HARKAVY, *Likkute Kadmoniyoth*, p. 93 and 96 = SCHECHTER, *Jewish Sectaries* II, p. 21; HADASI, *l. c.*, ALPH. 315-319; NICOMODI, *Gan 'Eden*, 'Arayoth 9; BASHIAZI, 'Addereth 'Elijah, *Nashim* 3.

⁶⁾ Cf. KIRKISANI, *Kitab'l-Anwar*; English by NEMOY, *HUCA* VII, p. 326.

⁷⁾ Notes 33 and 49.

⁸⁾ It is hardly possible to find an adequate English rendering for this term; cf. the commentators *ad loc.*, including R in note 44.

that point, it cannot be ascertained whether the Star = מְחַקֵּק = Searcher of the Law is identical with the Teacher of Righteousness, as held by some scholars ¹⁾; or some later leader of the sect, as held by others ²⁾; or some precursor of the Teacher of Righteousness, prior to the crystallization of the sect, its ultimate founder in a sense. If his journey to Damascus is placed in the period of the land's devastation in V 20 = Israel's delivery to Nebuchadnezzar in I 5, he is said in I 10-11 to precede the Teacher of Righteousness by 20 years; a precise or round figure which apparently has not—nor need have ³⁾—any scriptural counterpart.

In view of the foregoing uncertainties, one cannot know the precise date claimed by the author of the ZF for the origin of his sect. It is clear, however, that, not unlike the pseudepigraphists with whose works he shows himself thoroughly familiar, he claims intimate acquaintance with sundry events in the biblical period, events beyond the range of knowledge of the non-initiate who have access to the canonical books of the Bible only. Relying on recondite sources of information, perhaps also on his own imagination to some extent, he sets the origin of his sect in the biblical period; a phenomenon not without parallels elsewhere ⁴⁾.

Now his claim, although hardly to be accepted as a trustworthy tradition, opens up a new vista. There is room for a dating of the events alluded to in the ZF and DSS different from both R's and other scholars'. As distinct from the current view, the rise of the sect, its migration to Damascus, its heroes and villains, *etc.*, are not to be set in a period commencing 390 years after—or some vague later period erroneously computed by the sectarian writer to have commenced 390 years after—the Babylonian conquest of Jerusalem. As distinct from R's thesis, on the other hand, those events are not to be thought as commencing with that conquest. The truth is likely to lie between those two extremes. The events concerned, hardly entirely fictitious, are to be sought at an age—possibly somewhere in the blank periods

¹⁾ Cf. SCHECHTER, *l.c.*, p. xiii and xxiii-xxiv.

²⁾ Cf. ROWLEY, *l.c.*, p. 35. His identification with Ezra by R, note 49, hardly deserves serious consideration.

³⁾ Pace R, notes 11 and 13.

⁴⁾ E.g. the Samaritan claims that 'already Noah sacrificed on Mt. Gerizzim and that Judah's apostasy from Israel's true religion (= Samaritanism) originated with Eli of Shiloh, *Chron. Sam.*, *l.c.*, p. 194 and 205; or KIRKISANI's similar presentation of Jeroboam as the initiator of the Rabbanite defection from true (= Karaite) Judaism, *l.c.*, p. 322-326 and 330.

of the Persian or early Greek phase in the history of Palestine—far away from the sectarian writers' own age. Their pretentious claim of the hoary antiquity of their sect, whether or not they presented it with a *bona fide* belief in its veracity, thus had a fair chance of being accepted by their readers.

The question of the date of composition of the ZF and DSS—to be solved, independently, on the basis of evidence other than the dates of the events alluded to in those documents—bears but indirectly on the dates of the events they allude to. A nebulous atmosphere pervading all the documents in question, the characters therein are vague and indistinct to the degree of appearing as types rather than individuals. Even the Teacher of Righteousness, so ingeniously sought by scholars in one or another figure prominent in Jewish history, is but a shadowy phantom. As a religious leader, presumably a man of mark, he bears little comparison with any of his counterparts. Characters far less significant, subjects of trivial episodes in the various religious literatures, stand out more clearly than he; let alone Moses and the other Hebrew prophets, Jesus and the apostles or Mohammed and his followers. That dimness is no doubt partly due to the mystifying manners of a secretive sect, the fragmentary condition of its extant documents and our insufficient knowledge of its particular brand of Hebrew. The mediocre literary ability of at any rate some of the sectarian writers ¹⁾, is also likely to be in part at fault. To no mean extent, however, the haziness of the documents concerned must come from their writers' lack of real knowledge of the origin and early history of their sect. To the writers themselves, the founders of the sect and their opponents were legendary figures looming dim and blurred through the mist across the vast expanse of many centuries. As regards the writers' remoteness in time from the subject of their documents, the highly controversial issue of the documents' dates—whether they be placed in the 2nd or 1st century BCE, in the 1st or 2nd century CE, or as late as the 8th century CE—makes only a difference in degree.

Beside the foregoing endorsement of R's rendering of the crucial **ליתתו אותם** in the ZF as "when He gave them", thanks are also due to R for having brought into focus the essential difference in the ZF

¹⁾ This point, unduly stressed in ZEITLIN's and DRIVER's rather exaggerated strictures on the sectarian writers, is hardly relevant to the dating of the DSS and ZF; 200 BCE being quite as likely a date of poor quality writings as 600-800 CE.

between references to the past and those to the future. R claims to be able, as a result of his thesis, to make a threefold distinction in the ZF. *Ipsissimis verbis*: "to determine when the text is referring to the past history of Israel as recorded in scripture, when it is alluding to contemporary circumstances or experience, and when it is contemplating the future". A highly valuable distinction indeed, even though subject to appreciable modification. The references to the past concern not the history of Israel but, as has been seen, that of a sect. With their two precise dates the 390 years in I 5-6 and the 20 years in I 10, they belong to the remote past. The mention in VIII 11 = XIX 24 of "the chief—or first (= ראש)—of the kings of Greece" probably likewise belongs to the remote past; as that designation, notwithstanding the various attempts at other identifications, best fits Alexander the Great. Of allusions to contemporary¹⁾ circumstances there is, *pace* R, no reliable evidence in the ZF. The censures on the sect's opponents, extremely vague in all their incisiveness, are equally true—or equally untrue—as regards a great many phases in Jewish history. The sole data of an apparently more specific nature are those concerning the מורה היחיד or יורה היחיד variously rendered "Unique Teacher" or "Guide of the Sapientia". They are: the penalty in XIX 33-XX 1 held in store for apostates from the sect²⁾ "from the day of passing away of the מורה היחיד to the rise of the Messiah from Aaron and from Israel"; the prophecy in XX 13-15 concerning the interval of about 40 years "from the passing away of the יורה היחיד till the destruction of all the men of war who turned back with the Man of Falsehood"; and possibly the designation of the sect in XX 32 as אנשי היחיד³⁾ = followers of the מורה היחיד.

There is no reason to doubt the general assumption of scholars⁴⁾, apparently including R, that the mentioned 40 years are identical with the interval from the passing away of the מורה היחיד to the

¹⁾ In view of R's analysis of Texts A and B of the ZF into 5 or 6 distinct strata—cf. above note 1 on p. 295, also his notes 14, 79, 82, 96a and 109—the meaning of his "contemporary" must vary with the respective dates of the strata concerned.

²⁾ Those turning aside from "the well of living waters" after entering the "new covenant" that had been made in "the land of Damascus". R's happy rendering, note 66, of ברית חדשה בארץ דמשק as "the-in-the-land-of-Damascus-new-covenant", even though not equivalent to "the *exilic* new covenant", hits the nails right on its head.

³⁾ Cf. RABIN, *l. c.*, note 1 *ad* XX 32, who suggests that אנשי היחיד may be short for מורה היחיד אנשי.

⁴⁾ Cf. SCHECHTER, *l. c.*, p. xiii; and ROWLEY, *l. c.*, p. 40 and 64.

rise of the Messiah from Aaron and Israel. The assumption on the other hand that the *מורה היחיד* is an historical character, endorsed by R who thinks of Judas Maccabeus ¹⁾, is unwarranted. As evident from the contexts of his occurrence, the sectarian places his advent in the future: 40 years before that of the Messiah from Aaron and Israel. The eschatological notion of 40 years' interval of tribulation between two successive Messiahs to arise in the future, apparently also alluded to in the Qumran Fragment of a Commentary on Psalm xxxvii recently published by ALLEGRO ²⁾, has numerous parallels in the collection of small *Midrashim* edited by JELLINEK ³⁾. The first of the two Messiahs, the *Mashiah b. Joseph*, is to be defeated and slain by his impious enemy Armilos who is once also named "Antichristo". In the course of the ensuing 40 years, many of the Messiah's followers will be seduced to apostasy to Armilos. In the end, with the advent of the second Messiah, the *Mashiah b. David*, Armilos and his abettors will perish and the faithful remnant will be saved ⁴⁾. Whilst it is not to be suggested here that the above eschatological expectation is an exact parallel to that in the ZF, one cannot but be struck by essential similarities; the *מורה היחיד* in the ZF corresponding with the suffering *Mashiah b. Joseph*, his opponent the Man of Falsehood with Armilos, and the Messiah from Aaron and Israel with the victorious *Mashiah b. David*. Moreover, the very name *מורה היחיד* is reminiscent of an old *aggadah*, already recorded in the Talmud ⁵⁾, that the death of the *Mashiah b. Joseph* is alluded to in the obscure prophecy about widespread mourning for him whom they have thrust through "as one mourneth for an only son" (*כמספד על היחיד*) ⁶⁾. Similarly, the prophetic "Awake, O sword, against My shepherd ... smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered..." ⁷⁾, evidently connected in the ZF with the tribulations prior to the advent of the Messiah from Aaron and Israel ⁸⁾, is assumed in Jewish tradition to allude to the wars after the death of the *Mashiah b. Joseph* ⁹⁾.

Whilst the above details about the two Messiahs are first recorded

¹⁾ Cf. above p. 293.

²⁾ *PEQ* lxxxvi, 1954, p. 69-75.

³⁾ *Bet ha-Midrash*, 2nd ed. (Jerusalem, 1938).

⁴⁾ *Ibid.* I p. 56, II pp. 56 and 61, III p. 80, IV p. 125.

⁵⁾ B.T. Suk. 52a; cf. P.T. Suk. V 55b.

⁶⁾ Zech. xii 10.

⁷⁾ *Ibid.* xiii 7.

⁸⁾ XIX 7-11.

⁹⁾ Cf. IBN EZRA, *ad loc.*

in the mentioned *Midrashim* of uncertain dates ¹⁾, already the Suran Gaon Saadia in the tenth century CE bases them on what he names "a tradition of the ancients" ²⁾. The general notion of two successive Messiahs is in fact, as has been stated, already traceable many centuries earlier: in the Talmud ³⁾. At what age notions of that kind first arose, is quite as difficult to ascertain as the date of the ZF. Actually, the passing away of the מורה היחיד is mentioned in one single document only: Text B of the ZF ⁴⁾. Whilst Texts A and B partly overlap, there is no evidence that they are fragments of the selfsame document ⁵⁾. In some respects, each of the two Texts goes its own distinctive way ⁶⁾. That being so, the date of each is a question by itself. The problem of the date of Text A, a small fragment of which was found at Khirbet Qumran ⁷⁾, is linked with that of the DSS. Text B, for which there is no evidence of that kind, may date from an appreciably later phase in the history of the sect ⁸⁾. Be that as it may, the מורה היחיד was evidently thought of as a figure still hidden in the future. His advent was possibly expected in the near future, as the sectarian writer may have believed the eschatological *dénouement* to be just round the corner. The notion of the immediacy of the final catastrophe may also be sensed in the *Midrashim* about the *Mashiach b. Joseph*. It is also possible that the מורה היחיד was thought of as a future reincarnation of the Teacher of Righteousness of the

¹⁾ Cf. JELLINEK, *l.c.*, II, p. xxii; *JE* I, p. 675-685.

²⁾ Cf. *Emunoth we-De'oth*, ch. 8.

³⁾ Cf. also *Pesikta* ed. FRIEDMANN, p. 72-73 and the parallels cited there, for the interval between two messianic appearances which in many respects resembles that in the ZF and its mentioned parallels.

⁴⁾ The supposed allusions in DSH to the martyrdom of the Teacher of Righteousness are, *pace* DUPONT-SOMMER, rather problematic; cf. ROWLEY, *l.c.*, p. 34 note 5. Besides, the Unique Teacher, as has been stated, is not in the physical sense identical with the Teacher of Righteousness.

⁵⁾ The combination of Texts A and B by RABIN, *l.c.*, p. viii and 26-37, into what he calls a "critical text", fails to convince.

⁶⁾ *E.g.* אלה מלטו בקץ הפקודה הראשון והנסוגים הסגירו לחרב in Text A VII 21 distinctly refers to the past, whilst its counterpart אלה ימלטו בקץ הפקודה והנשארים ימכרו לחרב בבוא משיח אהרן וישראל in Text B XIX 10-11 quite as distinctly refers to the future. RABIN's treatment of those two texts, *l.c.*, p. 30-33, is an eloquent testimony for the weakness of his theory.

⁷⁾ Cf. *TbLZ* LXXVII, 1952, p. 723.

⁸⁾ Also in their attitude to Judah, Texts A and B differ. Whilst Text A (*e.g.* IV 11 and VII 12-14) is decidedly hostile, Text B (*cf.* XX 26-27 and RABIN's comments *ad loc.*) appears quite as sympathetic as DSH and DSW; *contra* the combination by ROWLEY, *l.c.*, p. 41 note 5, of DSW with Text A of the ZF.

past¹⁾. However all that may be, it makes no difference whatever to his not being an historical character.

To sum up the result of this investigation, the ZF deal either with the distant past or with the future but never with the sectarian writers' own age. The 3 chronological data in the ZF yield, despite their apparent preciseness, as little historical information, in historians exact sense of the term, as the less precise data in the DSS. The only sort of information obtained from the ZF is the insight—as far as it goes—into the notions of an obscure sect. The claim of that sect to have arisen at the age of Nebuchadnezzar, has to be taken *cum grano salis*. Its eschatology, as also the other points of contact between its writings and the various branches of pseudepigraphic and rabbinic literature, are as yet insufficient to establish its identity or to ascertain the details of its history.

London

¹⁾ Text A VI 10-11 distinctly refers to the future advent of a **יורה צדק**, a name partly resembling both **מורה צדק** and **יורה היחיד** but identical with neither. Text B XX 31-32, on the other hand, apparently identifies the future **יורה צדק** with the Messiah from Aaron and Israel. The **יורה היחיד** and the latter may well be two successive incarnations of the **מורה צדק**. Cf. the literature cited by ROWLEY, *l.c.*, p. 53 note 2, for the wide and complex controversy on this point.

SHORT NOTES

USES OF THE SEMITIC DEMONSTRATIVE ELEMENT Z IN HEBREW

The demonstrative particle $\text{d}/\text{d}/\text{z}$ is shared by all the Semitic languages of the Northwest and South, and shows an interesting semantic development which can be traced in Hebrew (as in its sister dialects ¹).

The most common use of this particle is, of course, as a simple adjectival demonstrative of the 'this—the man' or 'the man—the this' types, which need no illustration. The next stage in development is to give to the adjectival demonstrative the force of a substantive, 'this man/thing', which again is common enough to need no elaboration. From this, it is but a short step to the use of the demonstrative particle as a relative: 'the man, the one in the house' = 'the man who is in the house', and Aramaic and Arabic and their cognate dialects have this as their usual construction. But here Hebrew turns aside from the main stream, preferring the element š in company with East Semitic and the coastal dialects of Phoenicia, at least in its colloquial ²).

¹) The various orthographic forms in which this element appears in the various Semitic languages is an interesting study in itself, but not one with which I am dealing here. The Hebrew forms are: זֶה , זֹאת (זֹאתָ), זו , and זוּ , and in the doubly demonstrative forms הַזֶּה , הַזֹּאת (= هَذَا ; cf. Ibn Barūn in his 'Book of Comparison between the Hebrew and Arabic Languages', I, quoted by P. WECHTER, *JAOs* 61 (1941) p. 176b; G. R. DRIVER, *JTS* xxx (1929) pp. 377f., *VT* i (1951) pp. 244 f.), הַזֶּה , הַזֹּאת , and possibly also לֹאז (1 Sam. xx 12 for לֹאזוּ) and הַלֹּאז (1 Sam. xx 19, for הַלֹּאזוּ cf. S. R. DRIVER, *Notes on the Book of Samuel*², 1913, pp. 167 f.). There has certainly been confusion between זֶה and זוּ in Hebrew (cf. BARTH, *Pronominalbildung*, 1913, p. 153) as between d and dw in early Arabic inscriptional material (cf. RABIN, *Ancient West Arabian*, 1951, p. 205). With only our comparatively late MSS to work on, we cannot be certain of such minutiae as the original orthography of particles like these in Hebrew.

²) Allowing SEGAL's theory to be correct, that the northern š (שׁ) worked its way south in the colloquial, and thus into Mishnaic Hebrew where it was preserved (*Mishnaic Hebrew Grammar*, 1927, p. 43). On consideration of the evidence available, my own feeling is that the classical אֲשֶׁר is etymologically unrelated to שׁ , thus with FLEISCHER, MÜHLAU, DELITZSCH, HOMMEL, HARPER, KRAETZSCHMAR, ZIMMERN, BROCKELMANN and GAENNSLE, who finds the missing substantive אֲשֶׁר



In poetry, however, it can also use \aleph , which would seem to indicate that this usage is a relic of the time when Hebrew stood closer to the Aramaic stream ¹⁾. But we are more concerned at present with its use than its origin, and the next stage of development, although used with increasing frequency in the Aramaic dialects is but rarely represented in Hebrew. This is the idiom whereby the \aleph particle, standing alone or in apposition to a previous noun, comes before a noun in the genitive and makes a circumlocutory genitival construction of the type דְּבֵיתִי 'those of my house' = 'my kin', or רִישָׁא דְּמַלְכָּא 'the head, the one of the king' = 'the king's head'. In translating these constructions we usually use the word 'of', but even in the first example above it will be noted that the preposition 'in' might equally well have been used. All that the particle does, in fact, like any other genitival construction, is to bring one noun into close relationship with another, the nature of that relationship depending on the sense of the phrase. Where the genitive expresses a particular quality or abstraction, the genitival relationship can in fact be reversed. For example. רִישָׁא דְּמַלְכָּא must mean 'the king's head', but רִישָׁא דְּמַלְכָּא means, 'the Spirit, the one possessing Holiness' = 'the Holy Spirit', and in Arabic, of course, the particle ذُو comes to bear the meaning 'possessor of' ²⁾ although, in fact, it can be used in phrases where this meaning is quite inapplicable ³⁾. Classical Hebrew expresses the same idea by means of the

'place' in such sentences as בְּאֶשֶׁר תָּמוּת אֲמוֹת (Ru. i 17), (*AJSL* xxxi (1914-15) pp. 3 ff.), with which one might well compare the local (and sometimes temporal) use of the Accadian *ašar* (Cf. VON SODEN, *Grundriss d. Akk. Gr.*, 1952, § 116f). Against this, seeing \aleph as a shortened or otherwise derived form of אֲשֶׁר, stand OLSHAUSEN, GESENIUS, EWALD, SPERLING, BÖTTCHER, KÖNIG (with variations on the origin of the ³aleph expressed in the two volumes of his *Lehrgebäude*, I, pp. 135 ff. II, 322 f.), BAUMANN, PHILIPPI and EITAN (who is reduced to finding a deictic element *r* in the Semitic languages, cf. *AJSL* xlv (1928) pp. 178 f.). With WRIGHT (*Comparative Grammar*, 1890, p. 118), we must "see the origin of the relative pronoun somewhere in the region of the demonstratives". It is the more surprising, then, that Phoenician and Hebrew should have preferred a particle with the element \aleph which does not appear in any of its demonstratives, which include, of course, personal pronouns. We cannot doubt that, at one stage of its history, Hebrew had two dialects which were characterised by differing demonstratives, the one in \aleph , the other in \aleph , or perhaps one had both, meaning 'nearer' and 'further' respectively. Presumably, the \aleph personal pronoun which must have underlain it went the way of the old *Shaph'el*.

¹⁾ Cf. Z. S. HARRIS, *Development of the Canaanite Dialects*, 1939, p. 70, and below, p. 311 n. 4.

²⁾ Cf. WRIGHT, *Arabic Grammar*, 1896, p. 265 C.

³⁾ Note the examples quoted in RECKENDORF, *Arabische Syntax*, 1921, p. 152,

e. g., ذَاتُ حَلِيلٍ, '(Weib) eines Gatten'; ذَا صَبَاحٍ, 'eines Morgens'.

construct state ¹⁾, but since we have noted that the retention of ζ as relative is continued in the archaic language of the poet, it might be expected that we should find traces of these other developments also. This is, in fact, the case, and once recognised serves to avoid misunderstandings in the text. Many years ago GRIMME suggested ²⁾ that this usage had been preserved in the ancient Canaanitizing war-song of Deborah (Jud. v 5) and the closely related Ps. lxxviii (v. 9), in the phrase יהוה זה סיני (אלהים), 'God of Sinai' to be compared with the Nabatean דושרא, 'The One of Sh.', *Dusares*, the chief god of that people ³⁾. It seems that a striking example may also be found in the messianic prophecy of Mic. v, where in v. 4, זה שלום may be rendered 'Possessor of (Lord of) Peace', and compared with the שר שלום of Isa. ix 5. Similarly, in Ps. xxxiv 7, the phrase זה עני ought to be understood as 'the poor man', lit., 'he possessing affliction or poverty' (reading עני for MT עני).

The particle זו, as a relative, usually stands before a verb, as in Ex. xv 13, 16, Isa. xlii 24, xliii 21, etc. ⁴⁾, but in Ps. xii 8: תצרנו מן-הדור זו לעולם we can see a use of זו corresponding to אשר ל and, more cogently, to the later של. The basic construction is 'from the generation, the one of everlasting' = 'from the everlasting generation', and is to be compared with the remarkable parallel in Ugaritic:

¹⁾ Cf. GESENIUS-KAUTZSCH, *Hebrew Grammar*²⁸, § 128p; e.g.: בגדי קדש; 'the holy garments', (Ex. xxix 29); אהות עולם; 'an everlasting possession' (Gen. xvii 8).

²⁾ ZDMG 50 (1896) p. 571; cf. also W. F. ALBRIGHT, *JBL* 54 (1935) p. 204; BASOR 62 (April 1936) p. 30, HUCA 23 (1950-51) I. p. 20 and H. S. NYBERG, *Hebreisk Grammatik*, 1952, § 84 j Anm. 2, who renders it, quite legitimately, 'han på Sinai, Sinais herre'.

³⁾ Cf. G. A. COOKE, *North Semitic Inscriptions*, 1903, pp. 218 f.

⁴⁾ Note the very interesting parallel of Ps. ix, 16 : ברשת-זו טמנו ורשתו אשר טמן of Ps. xxxv 8. This use of זו as an uninflected relative particle has its counterpart, as is well known, in the Tayyî dialectal ُ (cf. *Lisānu l-'Arab*, xx 348, etc. and RABIN, *op. cit.*, p. 205 with references quoted there). RABIN (*ibid*, p. 205) sees this as another example of the very real connection between the ancient West Arabian dialects of Arabic and Hebrew and in passing we might note the same usage in Safaitic (cf. LITTMAN, *Syria* IV C, 1943, p. XVI). By other routes he comes to the same conclusion as that stated above regarding the derivation of ζu as a relative, 'since the Hebrew ζu is poetical and archaic, it may be presumed, if we accept the mixture theory, to derive from the non-Canaanite side'. He would, however, I am sure, be the first to agree that the origins of Hebrew do not require a mixture theory of the rather gross form of that proposed by BAUER-LEANDER for their explanation.

'*abdk.an.wd'lmk*, 'thy servant am I and thine eternal slave' (lit.: 'and one-of-thine-eternity')¹).

Bearing in mind this determination of the genitive by a possessive suffix, something of the sort may be meant in the enigmatic Hab. i 11, where *זה כחו* would then mean 'his Strong One' or, 'Possessor (Source) of his s.', perhaps a borrowed phrase with cultic significance²).

Manchester

J. M. ALLEGRE

THE ROOT *MHH* ATTESTED IN UGARITIC

As far as I am aware the root *m h b* has not yet been found in the Ugaritic texts published until now. In three instances a word *mhb* occurs, but in two of these (1 Aqht : 201 and 2 Aqht : I : 39) it seems to be quite a different word of which the meaning is not yet clear to me. In the third case, however, where the word *mhb* occurs (GORDON, 125 : 27) it had, as far as I know, always been brought into connection with the Accadian word *muhbu* "brain". This vision was favoured by the fact that in the context the word is followed by *riš* "head" and the usual translation "brains of the head" was not too far fetched, but it does not make any sense.

It concerns the following passage in text 125 : 26, 27:

al tkl bn qr 'nk
mhb rišk udm't

GORDON translated:

"Do not exhaust, O my son, the well of thine eyes
Nor the brain of thy head with tears!"

and GINSBERG: "Waste not thine eye with flowing,
The brain in thy head with tears."

¹) 67 : II : 12; cf. C. H. GORDON, *Ugaritic Handbook*, 1947, § 13.65.

²) I note that EITAN has already suggested a similar interpretation in a previous number of this journal (IV (1954), p. 281), only making the phrase refer to the people 'possessed of power'. Perhaps the other possible instances of this use of the *Z* particle noted in this paper may soften BIRKELAND's objection to GRIMME's interpretation of the Sinai phrase in Jud. v 5 (*Studia Theologica* II (1949-50), p. 201-202). Even so, his linguistic objections are difficult to understand, since he admits that the Aramaic *dt* makes as good a starting point as any for the development of the usage later so common in Arabic. Its possible occurrence in Ugaritic may put it back to the 14th century in N.W. Semitic, and, in any case, can it be denied that the 12th century Song of Deborah shows already a long history of linguistic and poetic development? The fact that the usage was lost in Hebrew at an early (relatively speaking) stage is accounted for by the break in tradition represented by the importation or emphasis on the *f* group of demonstratives discussed above.

In the passage king Krt bids his son to stop weeping and to go and call his sister Ttmnt from whom Krt wants to conceal his serious illness. Krt's son should stop weeping so that his sister should not see any signs of his grief. Now it is impossible for him to waste his brain with tears or in weeping. Therefore I suggest to see in *mḥ* the Imper. of a verb *mḥḥ*, well known in Hebrew, "to wipe away". Then we should translate: "Waste not, O son, the flowing of thine eye, wipe thy head clean of tears."

In Is. xxv 8 the verb is used also of the wiping away of tears. Thus the root *mḥḥ* "wipe" does occur in Ugaritic and here it fits the context excellently.

As a further result of this and the fact that *riš* "head" is used instead of *pnm* "face" (as in Is. xxv 8) it may be suggested that *riš* actually is the front or face part of the head (though it also indicates the whole of the head) while *qdqd* is that part of the head where the hair grows. In Hebrew the derivatives of *roš* show that it requires the meaning of "that which is in front", "that which comes first". Especially when *roš* has the meaning of "beginning" as in Ex. xii 2 (of a month), Ezek. xl 1 (of a year) and Is. li 20 (of a street), it does not mean "head" = "beginning" because it is topmost, but because it is foremost.

Groningen

C. J. LABUSCHAGNE

A GLOSS IN JEREMIAH VII 4

The puzzling word הָמָה in this verse seems to be most simply explained by its presence in an intrusive marginal note. Presumably there have been in all ages people who liked to point out the obvious; and certainly copyists have not always been fully alert mentally when engaged on their task. The suggestion offered is that a reader wrote in the margin הַמָּה הֵכֵל יְהוָה indicating by הָמָה the words to which דְּבַרִּי הַשִּׁקָּר refer. A copyist took this marginal note to signify an omission in the text, where he accordingly inserted it. This explains also the discrepancy between the existing Hebrew text and that of the Septuagint. In the former the words הֵכֵל יְהוָה occur three times, whereas in the latter their equivalent is read only twice. Instances of the single repetition of a word are found elsewhere in the Hebrew text, as in Jes. li 9, 12, 17, lii 1. The word ἐστίν is probably an exegetical addition of the translator. A similar exegetical preoccu-

pation led in the Peshitta to the change from the 3rd pers. plur. masc. (המה) to the 2nd pers., giving the meaning 'You are the temple of the Lord'.

OXON.

EDMUND F. SUTCLIFFE

CONCERNING THE FUNCTION OF 'ĒTH

The learned article by Dr JOSHUA BLAU on the use of 'ēth before the nominative (*V.T.* IV (1) pp. 7-19) simplifies the issue by explaining away the alleged nominatives as accusatives. But the question naturally arises, "Are we justified in exalting a statement of oft-observed sequence into a rigid law?" If 'ēth very often precedes an accusative, does it follow that what comes after is necessarily in the accusative? Not at all, yet that is how some would love to have it. One must ever bear in mind that grammatical rules like the so-called natural laws are mere rough approximations based on observation of average behaviour. But the real truth must cover all instances, and exceptions should modify the hitherto held rule in the direction of more accurate statement. For this reason it seems to me that we must give up the notion that 'ēth is a mark of the accusative, since in fact it only marks *some* accusatives, to wit, those that are defined and in prose. That it also precedes nominatives is plain, and two clear cases may here be noted:

2 Sam. xxi 22: 'ēth-'arba'ath 'ēlle yull-dhū l-hārāfā.

"These self-same four were born to the giant". 2 Kin. vi 5:

way'hî hā'ēhādh mappîl haqqôrā w'eth-babbarzel nāfal 'el-hammāyim
 "But as one was felling a beam, the iron itself fell into the water".
 Here 'ēth is used to *emphazise* the following noun.

This essentially emphatic use of 'ēth comes out strongly in Num. xxii 33: gam-'ōth-khā haragtî w'ōthāh heḥyēthî.

"Thee also had I slain, and her had I kept alive". Hence 'ēth is essentially an emphatic particle stressing the word following, whether it be subject or object. Since in many sentences the action moves from subject to object and the latter, if definite, is the new focus of attention, it takes the emphatic particle, 'ēth before it. If, on the other hand, emphasis is laid on the subject, this takes the emphatic particle.

Finally, the reading w'eth Shaddai in Gen. xlix 25, though "awkward", yea because awkward, needs defending and not liquidating. The Masoretic scholars retained it without a Q'rê, and that in a well-known and widely read passage in one of the oldest poems of

the O.T., Jacob's Blessing. Modern critics, however, follow DAHSE ¹⁾ in 1912 and write it off as "corrupt", emending it to 'el Shaddai, though the latter form occurs nowhere else in poetry in the O.T., Shaddai alone being used, and 'el Shaddai being entirely confined to prose.

Here, in reality, emphasis is laid upon the divine name, thus:

mē'el 'ābhīkḥā wəya'zrekḥā
wē'ēth Shaddai wibhārēkekḥā

"from thy father's God, who shall help thee,
 even Shaddai *Himself*, who shall bless thee".

West Ewell, Epsom

NORMAN WALKER

BEN SIRA AND THE TEACHING OF "TWO WAYS"

Agreements between DSD col. iii 13 — col. iv 26 and the Testament of Asher ch. i 3—ch. v 2 are known. There is a passage in Ecclesiasticus xxxiii (xxxvi) 7-15 which lacks the measure of conformity with the Manual of Discipline displayed by Test Asher i 3 — v 2 yet seems to be imbued with a similar spirit.

The keynote of DSD iii 13—iv 26 is eschatological: in Ben Sirā xxxiii 7-15 this note is absent. In DSD the division of mankind into two classes—respectively subject to the Spirit of Truth and to the Spirit of Perversion—is a temporary and transient arrangement upon which God has decided "in the mystery of his understanding"; in Ben Sirā the differences between things and beings are part of a harmonious permanent pattern in the world's design. In DSD the word קָץ (period) has, as it were, a 'vertical' aspect: all periods are focussed to the last one, קָץ נִחְרָצָה וְעִשּׂוֹת חֲדָשָׁה (DSD iv 25), and are never repeated. In Ben Sirā the aspect is a 'horizontal' one: οἱ καιροί and αἱ ἐποχαί and αἱ ἡμέραι are no more than dates and divisions of a calendar; they alternate in turn, are capable of repetition, and are each complementary to another. We might say that the outlook of the writer of the Manual was *dynamic*, governed by a sense of time, while that of Ben Sirā was *static*, governed by a sense of space. There is

¹⁾ *Textkritische Materialien zur Hexateuchfrage* (1912) pp. 3-5, 156. See also S. R. DRIVER: *Intro. Lit. O.T.* (1913), p. xxx note.

in Ben Sira xxxiii 7-15 no sign of the breathless lure which drew on the writer of DSD iii 13—iv 26.

These are the differences. Yet there is nevertheless enough similarity between the sections from the two writings to presume a connection between them.

Ben Sira xxxiii (xxxvi) 7-15:

διὰ τί ἡμέρα ἡμέρας ὑπερέχει
καὶ πᾶν φῶς ἡμέρας ἐνιαυτοῦ ἀφ' ἡλίου;
ἐν γνώσει κυρίου διεχωρίσθησαν
καὶ ἡλλοίωσεν καιροὺς καὶ ἑορτάς.
ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀνύψωσεν καὶ ἡγίασεν
καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἔθηκεν εἰς ἀριθμὸν ἡμερῶν.

καὶ ἄνθρωποι πάντες ἀπὸ ἐδάφους
καὶ ἐκ γῆς ἐκτίσθη ἀδάμ:
ἐν πλήθει ἐπιστήμης κύριος διεχώρισεν αὐτούς
καὶ ἡλλοίωσεν τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτῶν.
ἐξ αὐτῶν εὐλόγησεν καὶ ἀνύψωσεν
καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἡγίασεν καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡγγισεν,
ἀπ' αὐτῶν κατηράσατο καὶ ἐταπείνωσεν
καὶ ἀνέστρεψεν αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ στάσεως αὐτῶν.

.....

ἀπέναντι τοῦ κακοῦ τὸ ἀγαθόν
καὶ ἀπέναντι τοῦ θανάτου ἡ ζωὴ —
οὕτως ἀπέναντι εὐσεβοῦς ἀμαρτωλός
καὶ οὕτως ἔμβλεψον εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔργα τοῦ ὑψίστου:
δύο δύο, ἐν κατέναντι τοῦ ἐνός. ¹⁾

¹⁾ The Hebrew text of the passage is not extant. SEGAL, basing his restoration chiefly on the Syriac reading, renders it as follows:

לְמָה מִיּוֹם יוֹם כִּי כָל
אֹר שְׁנָה מַעַל שָׁמַיָּא
בְּחֻמָּת יִי וְשִׁפְטוֹ
וְיֵשׁ מֵהֶם מוֹעֲדִים
מֵהֶם בְּכָרְךָ הִקְדָּשׁוּ
וּמֵהֶם שָׁם לִימֵי מִסְפָּר

Ben Sira's outlook differs profoundly from that of the writer of the Manual of Discipline; he is not burning with a passionate desire to place all things in relation to the last things—yet the scheme outlined in xxxiii 7-15 is the same as that in DSD iii 13—iv 26: mankind divided into opposite groups, respectively under the dominion of opposed spiritual powers. As this idea is rather rare in ancient Judaism, we might presume some remotely common foundation for both writings.

A comparison suggests itself with Ben Sira xlii 24 of which we possess beside the Greek Version also the Hebrew:

πάντα δισσά, ἐν κατέναντι τοῦ ἐνός
καὶ οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὐδὲν ἐκλιπόν

כָּלֶם שׁוֹנִים זֶה מִזֶּה

וְלֹא עָשָׂה מֵהֶם שֵׁי[א]

The word δισσά is incongruous in this place; both the Hebrew and the Greek Texts of Ben Sira state here that created things have,

וְגַם אִישׁ כְּלִי חֹמֶר

וּמִן עֶפֶר נֹצֵר אָדָם

חֻקֵּי יְיָ תִּבְדְּיָלֶם

וַיִּשֶׂם אוֹתָם דְּרֵי הָאָרֶץ

מֵהֶם בְּרַךְ וְהִרְמָה

וּמֵהֶם הִקְדִּישׁ וְאֵלֵיו הִקְרִיב

מֵהֶם קָלַל וְהִשְׁפִּילֶם

וַיִּדְחֲפֵם מִמַּעַבְדֵּיהֶם

.....
נוֹכַח רַע טוֹב

וְנוֹכַח חַיִּים מוֹת

נוֹכַח אִישׁ טוֹב רָשָׁע

וְנוֹכַח הָאוֹר חֹשֶׁךְ

הֵבֵט אֶל כָּל מַעֲשֵׂי אֵל

כּוֹלֵם שְׁנַיִם שְׁנַיִם זֶה לְעוֹמֶת זֶה

in their difference from one another, a purpose in the divine plan and fill perfectly their assigned place or rôle; nothing is disjointed or superfluous. The word δισά would indicate not merely division in the sense of separateness, but an inner cleavage or rupture of beings within themselves. Thus an inherent duality and imperfection of the created world would be implied ¹⁾. The expression δισά renders the passage susceptible of being understood in the sense of teaching that there are two opposed spirits striving within each man's heart (DSD iv 23), yet clearly *no* such meaning is implied here in Ben Sira. How then can we account for the choice of the expression δισά?

The Testament of Asher v 1 reads as follows: δύο εἰσὶν ἐν πάσιν, ἐν κατέναντι τοῦ ἐνός. Here the meaning is one of duality, of inward cleavage: ἐν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐνός κέκρυπται. At the same time the wording recalls that in Ben Sira xlii 24: δύο ἐν πάσιν = πάντα δισά; the rest of the two halfverses shows an even closer resemblance in both writings. Could it be that Ben Sira's grandson and translator knew the verse from the Greek translation of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, that the line had stuck in his mind and that he inappropriately used it when rendering the sayings of his ancestor into Greek?

London

PAUL WINTER

ARAWNA — NOM HITTITE?

Les versets 16 et svv. de 2 Sam. xxiv traitent l'histoire de l'aire de (ה)אֲרֹנָה, qui fut finalement acquise par David afin d'y construire un autel pour JHWH.

Le nom (ה)אֲרֹנָה est transmis sous plusieurs formes, mais constamment accompagné d'une notation de Qrê אֲרֹנָה ²⁾. Je voudrais suggérer la thèse, que ce mot viendrait du hittite et représenterait le substantif hittite, dont la prédésinentielle serait *arawanni-* signifiant „libre”.

La bible raconte que le אֲרֹנָה mentionné fut un Jébuséen, descendant du peuple qui dominait à Jérusalem avant la conquête par les Israélites. Le Jébuséen et le Hittite sont fréquemment mentionnés ensemble parmi les „aborigènes” de Palestine, notamment de sa

¹⁾ The newly discovered *Dissertation on the Three Natures* (Codex Jung) discusses the subject of gnostic Jewish sects, some of which ascribed to the Deity a twofold nature. See Henri Charles PUECH and Gilles QUISPÉL „Les écrits gnostiques du Codex Jung” (*Vigiliae Christianae* 1954 VIII pp. 1-51).

²⁾ 1 Chr xxi 15 et svv. et 2 Chr iii 1 on a la leçon אֲרֹנָה, mais cela peut être une déformation (phonétique) tardive, coïncidant avec Ὀρόννας de Jos. Ant. vii 13.4.

partie montagneuse (v. Num. xiii 29, Jos. xi 3). Selon la bible, c'étaient les Jébuséens, desquels Jérusalem fut conquise; néanmoins on ne sera point futile d'examiner à propos de cela une source extra-biblque, c'est-à-dire les lettres de Tel-el-Amarna. Dans les six lettres ¹⁾ qui contiennent les plaintes du gouverneur, „Roi de Jérusalem”, à son supérieur égyptien (à cause des incursions des Habiru), mention est faite plusieurs fois du nom de ce „Roi de Jérusalem”: *Abdiheba*, *heba*. On admet généralement, qu'il s'y agit d'un nom théophore comportant comme second élément le nom d'une figure divine, adoptée par les Hittites parmi leurs deux divinités supérieures, nom transcrit traditionnellement *kehepit*, *kehepa* ²⁾). Selon ce qui est connu de l'orthographe hittite, l'écriture à *p* simple — et non pas à *pp* géminé — représente une explosive sonore [*b*]; et le nom de cette divinité serait [*heba*, *hebit*] — ce qui est exactement conforme à la deuxième partie du nom de ce „Roi de Jérusalem”. Il n'y a rien à en conclure pour la race de ce roi ou gouverneur, mais on a observé de curieux rapports entre la Palestine et la culture hittite. Les auteurs ont aussi remarqué que, malgré la conquête du pays des Jébuséens et leur suppression, David a acquis l'aire d'Arawna (2 Sam. xxiv) par achat et non par force du titre des droits du conquérant. N'est-ce pas, qu'un groupe d'entre les Jébuséens, ou certains individus, sont restés libres? Celui qui désirait acquérir leurs immeubles devait les payer. Ce serait le cas d'Arawna; il était, semble-t-il, un „homme libre”.

Le substantif hittite *arawanni-* ne signifie pas simplement „libre” comme l'adjectif de la même racine *arawa-*. *Arawanni-* se trouve dans l'ancien code de lois de l'empire hittite, provenant probablement du 15ème à 13ème siècle avant l'ère chrétienne. Toute cette collection de règlements, qui traite principalement de lois civiles distingue suivant que le tort est fait à un esclave ou à un personnage libre. A peu près partout les mots „esclave” et „libre” se trouvent écrits par des idéogrammes, mais en quelques cas on a la lecture hittite en clair: *a-ra-wan-ni-* ou *a-ra-u-wan-ni* „libre, aristocrate” ³⁾).

Le mot *arawanni-* est donc un terme de l'organisation sociale de l'empire hittite, et il n'est pas étonnant qu'il ait pu se conserver en Palestine, quelle qu'ait été la race du porteur de ce titre ⁴⁾).

¹⁾ KNUDTZON, no. 285 svv.

²⁾ PAULY-WISSOWA, *Realenzyklopädie*, s.v. Jebusaei.

³⁾ HROZNÝ, *Le code hittite*, p. 146, no. 45.

⁴⁾ *Ewar-ne*, tiré du Hourrite et de sens apparenté („gouverneur”) est men-

C'est ici qu'il faut faire attention à l'élément ה- qui précède ארונה (Ktib אורנה) 2 Sam. xxiv 16. Il se peut que ce ה- est l'article et nous ne serions pas en présence d'un nom propre, mais d'une dénomination sociale: „l'homme libre”. De plus, le thème du substantif hittite *arawanni-* se termine en *-i*; les substantifs de ce paradigme peuvent avoir une double forme nominative suivant la prédésinentielle à laquelle est ajouté le morphème indo-européen du nominatif singulier, *-s*: *arawannis* ou *arawannias*. Les deux formes sont équivalentes, et il ne faut pas exclure la possibilité que nous ayons devant nous les deux variantes: ארניה (Qrê ארונה) vs. 18 — possiblement *arawannia-s* — et ארונה (ה) — *arawanni-s* ou **arawanne-s* car *i* et *e* sont souvent confondus dans l'orthographe hittite.

En vue de ces faits il ne serait pas trop hasardeux d'ajouter aux suggestions déjà faites ¹⁾ la possibilité de la dérivation proposée plus-haut pour le nom d'Arawna ²⁾.

Jérusalem (Isr.)

HAIIM B. ROSÉN

tionné par MAISLER (MAZAR) comme l'origine du titre הארונה dans לשוננו, 15, p. 41. Est-ce que ce terme hourrite serait d'origine hittite? *Arawanni-* en tout cas semble avoir une étymologie indo-européenne (FRIEDRICH, *Heth. Wb.*, s.v.).

¹⁾ Recueillies et reproduites sommairement dans אנציקלופדיה מקראית s.v. ארונה, comprenant la possibilité d'une dérivation du hittite et la suggestion de TUR-SINAI d'y voir une personification de l'arche d'alliance, ארון הקדש.

²⁾ Pour des autres contacts linguistiques entre la langue hittite et l'ancien sémitique (p. ex. *targumannu*, *šataru*, *ummānu* etc.) v. SOMMER, *Hethiter und Hethitisch*, p. 90-91. Ajouter *pattarpalḫi-* „un oiseau” = hitt. *pat-tar* (gr. πτε-ρὼν „aile” + *p-r-ḫ* „oiseau” (cp. πτε-ρ-σπερά).

REVIEWS

ROBERT NORTH S. J. *Sociology of the biblical Jubilee*. *Analecta biblica*, 4. Roma, Pontificio Istituto biblico 1954. 245 pp. avec Index général et index des passages scripturaires cités. Prix It. lire 3.900.

Le P. NORTH vient de publier un livre curieux et original sur la difficile question du Jubilé israélite. Il connaît admirablement la bibliographie du sujet et cite toujours favorablement ses prédécesseurs, même quand il ne croit pas pouvoir les suivre. De fait, au milieu de la masse des opinions divergentes où l'auteur devait chercher sa voie, il devait fatalement s'opposer à beaucoup. Mais il le fait avec bonne grâce et cite avec la même courtoisie les auteurs les plus oubliés du XIX^{ème} siècle et les opinions les plus autorisées du XX^{ème}.

Après un chapitre sur le texte où il donne parallèlement les traductions de l'hébreu, du grec, du Samaritain et de la Vulgate, il étudie les données du Pentateuque qui peuvent éclairer le texte (libération de l'esclave dans le code de l'alliance, la Shemittah du Deutéronome, Lévi. xxvi-xxvii, Num. xxxvi), les allusions qu'on trouve dans l'histoire d'Israël à un droit de rachat (Jér. xxxii, xxxiv) et à l'esclavage pour dette (Néh. v), et enfin quelques oracles prophétiques (v; g; Is. lxi). Ces textes orientent R. N. vers une enquête sur le problème de la grande propriété dans l'ancien Orient. Après quelques pages rapides sur les données sociales babyloniennes et égyptiennes (il conviendrait sans doute de distinguer suivant les époques), il montre que le code de Hammourapi (il eut été bon de citer la traduction d'EILERS) s'intéresse peu à la question, pas plus que le code d'Eshnunna (lequel ne connaît qu'un droit de préemption d'un cohéritier ou d'un vendeur antérieur). Il s'arrête plus longtemps à juste titre sur les institutions que révèlent les textes de Nuzu et sur les „cinquantenaires" de J. et H. LEWY (il eut été bon de mentionner une autre interprétation du *hamushtu* cappadocien, celle de TUR-SINAI dans *Bi. Or.* VIII, p. 16-24). Les sources postérieures (Livre des Jubilés, Philon, Josèphe, Diodore), pas plus que la *seisachtheia* grecque ou le *prosbul* de Hillel n'éclairent vraiment le *yobel* du Lévitique. Aussi l'auteur aborde-t-il la critique interne en cherchant à préciser le sens de ce mot. Rejetant l'étymologie qui rattache *yobel* à la corne du bélier (*ybl* dans le tarif de Marseille) et celle qui l'explique par la racine sémitique *ybl* au sens d'„apporter, produire", R. N. se base sur les traductions des Septante et sur les synonymes hébreux pour y voir un abandon, un don. On a quelque peine à se rallier à cette manière de voir car la racine, tant en hébreu qu'en accadien, implique un transport tandis que l'objet du *yobel* hébreu est avant tout une propriété immobilière. Je crois que l'auteur a raison de songer à cette racine, mais qu'il faut surtout en retenir un certain rapport avec le *yebul* hébreu, qui est une production agricole; le Lévitique va dans ce sens quand il fait remarquer que la vente d'un terrain consiste dans la vente d'un certain nombre de

récoltes. L'auteur a raison de chercher le point d'attache de notre texte avec des réalités, les observations des LEWY, de CANAAN (sur les usages des fellahs judéens) et l'étymologie feraient chercher ce point d'attache dans d'anciennes coutumes paysannes du terroir asiatique.

Mais c'est plutôt dans les institutions commerciales que cherche R.N. L'institution du jubilé consisterait dans la restitution au bout de 49 ans d'une propriété donnée en gage par un débiteur insolvable. Cette idée est intéressante et je crois également que l'institution est née ou a été conçue en fonction de besoins sociaux nés de l'esclavage (*Lévitique*, Paris 1951, p. 116). Je n'y aurai vu qu'une tentative sans application faite peu de temps avant la fin de la monarchie, à rapprocher d'autres textes législatifs qui donnent aux lévites une propriété foncière. La position de l'auteur est différente et, pour l'établir, il doit surmonter un certain nombre de difficultés. Tout d'abord il doit établir que l'année du jubilé est identique à la septième année sabbatique, sans quoi la mesure prévue ne peut qu'être utopique. Il croit pouvoir le faire en admettant tout d'abord qu'il y a „discrepancy” entre Lévi. xxv 8-9 et 10. Dans un cas on compte sept fois sept ans, donc quarante neuf, dans l'autre on parle de cinquantième année. A priori le texte semble impliquer que l'on sonne le cor au bout de quarante neuf ans pour annoncer la cinquantième année. Mais on pourrait discuter la manière de compter et admettre que la cinquantième pour les hébreux (on aurait aussi des textes hittites) serait pour nous la quarante-neuvième. La grosse difficulté à cette solution, R.N. s'en rend compte, c'est que Lévi. xxv 20-22 prévoit que la récolte de la sixième année assurera deux années de jachère. Comme le jubilé est un développement de l'année sabbatique il est normal qu'on ait ainsi parlé de la 6ème année au lieu de la 48ème, d'autant que le v. 9 prescrivait de compter par septénaires. Même si l'on voit dans ce texte une interpolation, il nous montre comment on comprenait la loi lors de la rédaction définitive du Pentateuque. Mais on peut admettre qu'à l'origine le jubilé équivaldrait à la septième année sabbatique.

La seconde difficulté consiste à démontrer que le jubilé n'est pas une année sacrée obligatoire pour tous en même temps, mais un terme propre au champ ou au débiteur propriétaire. R. N. reconnaît que cette interprétation se heurte „au sens apparent de certaines expressions du texte sacré” (p. 119). Il faudrait admettre que la proclamation solennelle faite à son de trompe le 10 du septième mois (xxv 9) n'est pas la proclamation d'une libération générale, mais la simple proclamation que pour un tel, pour le champ d'un tel, le jubilé est arrivé. La phraséologie du Lévitique interdit cette interprétation car ce genre de proclamation concerne toujours une fête ou une réunion d'intérêt général et non privé, mais on pourrait supposer là encore que c'est le rédacteur final qui a transformé le sens de la proclamation primitive. De plus les connexions entre année sabbatique (*Shemittah*) et jubilé paraissent telles à l'auteur qu'il veut voir dans la *shemittah* elle-même non pas une même année pour tous, mais un délai propre à chaque cas. Ceci est difficile à admettre car R. N. identifie lui-même (p. 184 s) l'année sabbatique à l'année où, selon Deut. xxxi 10, a lieu la lecture de la Loi. Ceci est une cérémonie publique où tout Israël est convoqué et cette année ne peut être que la même pour tous.

Une troisième difficulté vient de ce que notre texte parle toujours de vente

et non de gage. Le texte ne parle jamais d'une dette à éteindre, mais de prix de vente et c'est le calcul du prix de vente qui entraîne certains détails de législation. Comme le remarque l'auteur ce n'est pas tant la personne du débiteur qui est en jeu que la stabilité du bien dans la famille, la tribu, surtout la tribu de Lévi qui est spécialement protégée. L'hypothèse ne peut donc valoir pour notre texte, mais seulement pour les origines lointaines de l'année jubilaire. Mais si nous rattachons les origines du jubilé à celles de l'année sabbatique, nous voyons fort bien que les origines sont à chercher dans l'année sabbatique du Deutéronome, elle même n'étant qu'une extension aux dettes de la Shemittah agricole du code de l'alliance. Or il n'y a dans cette septième année du code de l'alliance ni dette ni gage. Il y a d'une part abandon de la récolte au profit du pauvre et d'autre part l'esclave *ḥinnām*. R.N. croit qu'il faut traduire „sans lui faire de renvoi de cadeaux”, mais les textes qu'il invoque ne semblent pas justifier cette traduction. Le mot signifie en Gen. xxix 15 et 1 Reg. ii 31 (id Job 9) l'absence de contrepartie. Or en Ex. xxi 2 la contrepartie de la libération ne pourrait être qu'un paiement par l'esclave et non un don supplémentaire donné par le maître. En 1 Reg ii 31 il s'agit d'un sang répandu par Joab qui n'est pas justifié par un sang préalablement versé. „*Rashly*” ne rend pas du tout l'injustice que David reproche à Joab; 2 Sam. ii a longuement expliqué pourquoi la mort d'Asahel n'étant pas imputable à Abner, Joab ne pouvait en justice invoquer le talion contre ce dernier.

Quoiqu'il en soit de ce détail nous ne trouvons rien dans les origines de l'année sabbatique du Lévitique qui rapporte cette institution à la restitution d'un gage pour dette, sinon Deut. xv 2 interprété comme le fait l'auteur (p. 187): quiconque détient un gage abandonnera ce gage à l'année de rémission. Il est probable que le Deutéronome a étendu aux dettes une mesure primitivement prévue pour une économie agricole; là encore, il ne semble pas qu'il y ait immeuble donné en gage par le débiteur, mais prêt plus ou moins onéreux fait par un créancier. Les v. 7 s. montrent bien que l'acte antérieur à l'année de rémission est un transfert opéré par le créancier à l'endetté puisqu'on lui recommande d'ouvrir sa main et de ne pas endurcir son cœur malgré la proximité de l'année de Shemittah. Réservant la possibilité d'une origine lointaine dans les coutumes agricoles de Juda, nous verrions plutôt dans le jubilé une mesure de protection de l'Israélite pauvre indépendante de l'année sabbatique.

L'auteur conclut par une étude intéressante sur la date et l'auteur de la loi; sa critique du système de P. HEINISCH est très sérieuse. Quant à sa même solution qui, se fondant sur l'économie agricole très primitive que suppose la loi du jubilé pour être praticable, l'explique par la nécessité du choix d'une politique sociale en fonction des lois de l'époque de la conquête, elle implique toute une étude sur cette conquête et ses conditions. Nous admettrions plutôt un point de départ archaïque systématisé en fonction de la théologie et des principes du code sacerdotal, si visibles dans toute la rédaction, tandis que les réformes de Néhémie v (là comme ailleurs) ne sont encore commandées que par le Deutéronome. L'auteur est donc tout à fait en droit de dégager une „théologie sociale du jubilé”. Cependant on aurait aimé plus de références aux passages d'esprit parallèle, ceux que les critiques rattachent au code sacerdotal. En tous cas ce livre

qui n'est pas d'une lecture facile car il est plein de faits, de citations et d'aperçus, est une importante contribution à la connaissance de la Loi israélite, et nous en remercions l'auteur.

Paris

H. CAZELLES

The Interpreter's Bible. Vol. 2: Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Samuel. New-York-Nashville, 1953.

Voici un nouveau volume de cette grande entreprise collective que dirige Mr G. A. BUTTRICK. Après une introduction sur le contenu du livre et son sens religieux, on trouve à chaque page une double traduction, la *King James version* et la *New revised Standard version*, suivies d'un double commentaire, commentaire exégétique grâce à quelques notes sur les points importants du texte, commentaire plutôt homilétique sur la portée religieuse actuelle du texte.

Mr N. MICKLEM a une formule heureuse quand il dit que le „Lévitique a été édité plutôt qu'écrit". Avec P. HEINISCH il estime que ces ordonnances et usages religieuses peuvent remonter à l'époque de Moïse, mais l'ensemble s'explique comme le résultat d'un développement des traditions et coutumes, on ne peut espérer donner des dates précises aux différentes lois. Une utilisation raisonnée de textes prophétiques comme Ez. xlv 18-20 ne permet-elle pas cependant des conclusions sur la date du rituel de Lévi. xvi? L'auteur, semble-t-il, aurait pu être plus ferme qu'il ne l'est dans le commentaire de ce chapitre. Il aurait pu aussi être moins timide sur l'étymologie de Azazel. Le rapprochement avec les démons-boucs de xvii 7 s'impose et l'on comprend trop bien une métathèse de l'*aleph* et du *zain* lorsqu'il fallut retirer tout caractère divin à ces démons. Judicieusement l'auteur distingue un rituel ancien et un rituel élaboré, mais il paraît difficile de ne pas rattacher au rituel archaïque l'expulsion du bouc émissaire au désert (v. 22a) plutôt que le v. 10. La critique littéraire paraît également insuffisante dans le calendrier des fêtes du ch. xxiii. La liste des fêtes a été complétée par une série d'oracles adventices; on ne souligne pas qu'après une première conclusion aux v. 37s, une reprise sur la fête des Tentes au v. 39 achève le cycle primitif qui ne comporte point d'allusion à l'exil, mais continue l'effort d'historicisation des fêtes cananéennes. Depuis longtemps les Azymes étaient rattachées à la Pâque, donc à la sortie d'Égypte. Ce texte rattache la fête d'Automne au désert; il ne restera plus qu'à rattacher la Pentecôte au don de la Loi sur le Sinaï. L'auteur est trop averti pour ne pas signaler cette tendance. Il semble qu'il aurait pu dégager toute la valeur religieuse de cet effort d'assimilation et de réinterprétation et qu'il y aurait là une vue profonde de la Révélation biblique tandis que les sens spirituels auxquels il recourt souvent ne donnent pas toujours ce qu'il y a de vital dans la religion d'Israël. L'auteur s'élève avec raison contre une interprétation magique des sacrifices de l'ancienne Loi, mais leur fait-il pleinement justice quand il explique l'offrande, surtout l'offrande sanglante par l'émotion qu'elle suscite chez le fidèle („the answer is emotional" p. 12)? En fait le Qorban est plus un „rapprochement" qu'un don. Le mets et le festin, c'est la vie de la communauté et le mets a

valeur religieuse quand il a été approché de la divinité et accepté par elle. C'est alors que le repas ne sera plus profane, mais sacré et la vie du groupe est alors une participation à la vie de la divinité. Ce n'est pas l'émotion du don qui compte mais la croyance à une union du groupe à la divinité qui le protège et lui donne la vie. Une société pastorale immolera et consommera du bétail, une société agricole présentera la première gerbe et la société israélite associera à l'animal une part de farine, ce sont toujours les mets essentiels qui feront l'élément primordial dans le banquet sacré: le groupe s'unit à son dieu qui lui a donné sur sa terre ses moyens de subsistance. Au lieu d'une émotion il semble qu'il faille voir là un réalisme sociologique garanti par une croyance. Le Dieu d'Israël n'est pas un pur dieu de nature, mais le Dieu spirituel des commandements et de la conscience morale, aussi le Lévitique interprétera-t-il le sacrifice en fonction de la notion de péché et concevra le rite non seulement comme un témoignage et une assurance de vie, mais comme une révivification. L'esprit juridique des textes sacerdotaux tendra à faire apparaître le sacrifice comme un paiement à la divinité frustrée, aussi l'holocauste tendra-t-il à prendre le pas sur le sacrifice de communion, mais ceci n'est qu'un aspect transitoire, le sacrifice de communion reprend toute sa force dans le livre des Chroniques. C'est pourquoi il ne semble-t-il pas que l'on puisse expliquer l'expiation (*kipper*) par la racine *káphar*, voiler. Les rites *kuppuru* à Babylone, rites de „frottement” sont des rites de guérison, de révivification. Mr MORALDI m'a fait remarquer que les textes souvent cités et qui m'avaient paru décisifs comme Ex. xxx 15; Deut. xxi 8 et surtout Gen. xxxii 21 ne l'étaient point. En particulier dans ce dernier texte il ne s'agit nullement pour Jacob de voiler par un présent (*minháb*) la face d'Esau de manière à ce qu'il ne voie plus la faute de son frère. D'après l'expression accadienne *kapáru pána* il s'agit de frotter, de laver le visage de quelqu'un pour le rendre propre, gai, bienveillant. Là encore le mot renvoie à une idée de vie et de joie. Quant à la *azkárab* la seule explication possible me paraît toujours être qu'il y a là non un „mémorial”, du moins à l'origine, mais que c'est le verbe initial, à la première personne du cohortatif, de la formule par laquelle on évoquait le nom divin au cours du rite. Je crois donc que ce commentaire, même au point de vue de l'interprétation des termes, et des rites aurait pu gagner en netteté. Mais il ne faudrait pas diminuer le mérite d'un travail d'esprit compréhensif, bien informé de la critique classique et plein de rapprochements topiques avec le Nouveau Testament.

Nous serons obligés d'être plus brefs sur les autres livres. J. MARSH rappelle les résultats de la critique littéraire sans entrer dans l'importante mais difficile question de savoir ce qui revient à l'écrit sacerdotal fondamental et aux compléments, quoique M. NOTH lui ait consacré une part notable de ses *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* parues en 1943. L'exégèse du livre reste très prudente; on regrette qu'elle n'ait pas fait davantage place à l'étude de ALBRIGHT sur les oracles de Balaam qui permettent de situer beaucoup mieux ces textes en fonction des Sutu, des Qénites, des Assurites (très probablement les Assurites de Gen. xxv 3), des Habiru... L'auteur n'a pas essayé d'utiliser la Septante pour éclairer les difficultés de xxiv 7a. Enfin au point de vue de la valeur religieuse du livre on eut

souhaite, plutôt que des considérations antialcooliques sur Num. vi 1s., une étude plus poussée de la théologie du ou des documents P relatives à la structure de la „communauté” choisie par Dieu. Même si l'on considère cette structure comme révolue il y a là des vues sur la présence de Dieu dans l'humanité que l'on ne peut abstraire du message biblique. Les pages de E. W. WRIGHT sur la théologie du Deutéronome sont beaucoup plus incisives sur l'élection du peuple et la direction donnée par Dieu aux destinées de la nation. Cette étude du message deutéronomique s'appuie sur une étude solide du texte. Comme VON RAD, et plus récemment A. ALT, l'auteur estime que le Deutéronome ne peut venir du sacerdoce de Jérusalem mais a son origine dans les milieux lévitiqes du Nord. Ce point de vue, autrefois défendu par A. WELCH, tend de plus en plus à prévaloir et éclaire bien des points de l'histoire d'Israël.

J. BRIGHT étudie de même le livre de Josué à la lumière de la théorie de M. NOTH. L'exposition, due à J. SIZOO, ne pouvait être que fort succincte pour les chapitres où sont énumérées les villes relevant de chaque tribu. Peut-être certains trouveront ils que dans le commentaire pratique du discours de Piréïs il ne conviendrait pas de mettre sur le même pied l'effort de constitution des Nations Unies et le mouvement oecuménique. L'appel à l'unité paraît plus en situation à propos du cantique de Débora, Jud. v 17. Dans ce livre des Juges nous craignons que Mr J. MYERS n'ait fait la part trop large au Deutéronomiste. Comme on le voit par l'introduction aux livres de Samuel de G. B. CAIRD, la part de l'éditeur deutéronomique est minime, quelques formules et quelques courtes notices de chronologie. La rédaction de 1 Sam. i-xii, rapprochée heureusement par MYERS de celle des Juges comme de Jos. xxiv, est due à une main élohiste. Quant aux chapitres xxi-xxiv de 2 Sam., ont-ils été vraiment déplacés? On sait qu'ils coupent le grand récit de la succession de David. C'est dans leur addition (à base de sources anciennes) que nous verrions la marque d'un éditeur deutéronomiste, préoccupé du Temple et du haut-lieu de Gabaon. Cet éditeur pourrait fort bien être celui qui a détaché de l'œuvre préalable les chapitres relatifs à Salomon pour en faire l'introduction d'une œuvre nouvelle où Salomon n'est plus tant le premier héritier de David que le constructeur du Temple et le premier coupable (à cause des autres sanctuaires du Mont des Oliviers). Mais ceci nous entraînerait à une discussion trop longue sur la composition du livres de Samuel (cf. VRIEZEN). Les auteurs de l'Interpreter's Bible n'avaient pas à reprendre ces difficiles problèmes de critique, ils avaient à donner à des non spécialistes un sens religieux du texte. Malgré les réserves signalées, et d'autres seraient à faire, on ne peut que saluer cet effort considérable et les encourager à s'attacher toujours davantage au texte.

Paris

HENRI CAZELLES

H. J. FRANKEN, *The Mystical Communion with Jhwh in the Book of Psalms*. Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1954. Price 8.— Dutch guilders.

The influence which the Danish scholar Joh. PEDERSEN continues to exert upon the study of the Old Testament is to be seen once again in this doctoral thesis. The very language of the author is reminiscent of PEDER-

EN's work, as when he speaks, for example, of 'the contents of the soul' (p. 21) or 'that which fills the soul' (p. 37).

The first chapter is devoted to the question of magic and mysticism in the Old Testament, and consists, for the most part, of a brief summary of the views of a number of scholars. The treatment, however, is far too cursory and much too second-hand to warrant the author's basic assumption that 'we think it justified to speak of the restriction of the personality in the case of magical influences, whereas we speak of the extension of the personality in the case of mystical bents' (p. 1).

In the second chapter the author discusses what he regards as the relevant terminology for understanding this 'mystical' communion with Yahweh in the psalms, i.e. (as transliterated by FRANKEN), *dmm*, *dmb* and derivatives, *ybh*, *hsh*, *maḥ^ase*, *qwb*, *dbq*, *hšq*, *ṭōb*, *sōd*, *kābōd*, *nōgaḥ*, *šrf* and *'ōr*. Here he has a number of interesting comments to make, but on the whole one is left with the disturbing impression that he tends to exaggerate the significance of what is often no more than simple metaphor. A typical example is that furnished by Psalm xviii 29, where 'the psalmist says that Jhwh lightens his camp'; for here the author's comment is, 'This shows that the light is separated into two worlds, the world of God and that of men, but they are parallel and the light on earth cannot exist without the light of God. There is light of God in the light of men' (p. 49). One could wish, too, that the author had shown more self-reliance (for there can be no question of his ability) in discussing the term *kābōd* or, rather, the expression *kābōd* (*sic*) *Jhwh*. In view of the author's main thesis so important an expression calls for a more thorough treatment than that accorded here, where he again builds too much upon the conclusions of other scholars instead of making a searching analysis of the expression for himself. To the reviewer it also seems quite remarkable that, while including the term *kābōd*, the author has neglected the still more important term *rūaḥ* in discussing his chosen theme.

In the third chapter, where the author develops his theme with regard to the 'restriction' and 'extension' of the personality, one's impression that he tends to impose his viewpoint on the material and to assume what he should have proved is confirmed by his treatment of the *berīt*, which is out of all proportion to the emphasis which he lays upon it. It is not enough to say, 'In this study we constantly assume that the psalms know the *berīt* as the fundamental fact on which piety can grow' (p. 60), and then proceed to say, 'The *berīt* as a pattern provided the distinctive character of mystical trends in the Old Testament' (p. 63). In fact the work as a whole, while it has a number of useful points to make, is marred by these easy assumptions and ready generalisations, as when the reader is told that 'it seems to have been characteristic for the cults of godheads in the Canaanite pantheons that one may become one with them in the rites' (p. 66), or 'We know that monotheism in a practical sense only developed slowly as a result of the covenant' (p. 68).

In the final chapter the reader is offered an exposition of Psalms xvi, xviii, xxv, xxvii, xxxi, xxxvi and lxiii in illustration and, indeed, confirmation of the author's main thesis, and it calls for no further comment. It

merely remains to be said that the foregoing remarks, although of a somewhat adverse nature, are intended to be constructive. The reviewer hopes that the author will continue to work in this field, but that he will do so by examining his assumptions more clearly and paying greater attention to the Old Testament data as a whole.

Aubrey R. JOHNSON

Karaite Anthology. Excerpts from the Early Literature. Translated from Arabic, Aramaic, and Hebrew Sources with Notes by LEON NEMOY. New Hawen, Yale University Press, 1952, XXVI + 412 pages.

On assiste actuellement à un renouveau de l'intérêt du monde savant pour les problèmes du Karaïsme. Mais tous les chercheurs se plaignent de l'absence de catalogues des manuscrits karaïtes, voire d'inventaires approximatifs. Cependant ces manuscrits constituent des fonds considérables dans plusieurs grandes bibliothèques. Il n'existe aucune bibliographie, fût-elle superficielle, des *karaïtica* déjà publiés. Jusqu'ici on ne possédait même aucun recueil qui, d'une manière condensée, pût donner une idée de la production intellectuelle karaïte.

Aussi il faut saluer avec une grande satisfaction la publication d'une anthologie consacrée entièrement au Karaïsme dans la série bien connue de Yale University Press. Le nom seul de l'auteur en dit assez: L.N., à côté de nombreux autres travaux, s'est distingué dans le domaine des études karaïtes par la publication de cinq volumes de *Kitāb al-'anwār wal-marākib*, l'oeuvre fondamentale de YA'QUB AL-KIRKISĀNĪ.

L'érudition considérable de L.N. faisait de lui un homme tout à fait qualifié pour entreprendre une revue rétrospective du développement de la pensée karaïte. L.N. a accompli sa tâche d'une manière plus objective que les auteurs des nombreuses autres publications sur le Karaïsme qui ont paru jusqu'ici.

L.N., comme il le dit dans son avant-propos, n'a pas dépassé l'an 1500 de l'ère chrétienne et n'a retenu que des textes déjà précédemment publiés. Il a voulu surtout donner les textes de valeur historique et littéraire, n'admettant les sujets théologiques qu'au cas où ils présentaient un intérêt général. L.N. a exclu de son programme les questions des règles de pureté, de calendrier, de grammaire et de lexicographie.

L'omission des deux premières catégories de textes est regrettable, ne serait-ce qu'en fonction des dernières découvertes faites dans le domaine biblique. Déjà KAUFMANN KOHLER, à plusieurs reprises, avait remarqué que les règles karaïtes de pureté étaient typiquement esséniennes. S. POZNAŃSKI, en 1905, puis le R.P. LAGRANGE, ont indiqué l'existence, chez les anciens karaïtes, des traces d'un calendrier solaire, basé sur le livre d'*Enoch* et le livre des *Jubilés*, avec mois de 30 jours, système qu'on retrouve dans le calendrier de Qoumrân¹⁾.

¹⁾ Cf. notre article *La Communauté de la Nouvelle Alliance et le Karaïsme*, dans les *Actes du XVI^e Congrès de l'Institut International de Sociologie*, Beaune, Septembre 1954.

L'anthologie proprement dite est précédée d'une introduction, où l'auteur donne un abrégé de l'histoire, de l'origine, et de l'essence du Karaïsme. Déjà précédemment L.N. avait fait la critique de la théorie artificielle et naïve représentant le Karaïsme comme l'oeuvre personnelle d'ANAN; il considérait que le Karaïsme résultait d'un complexe de causes variées¹). Actuellement encore, dans son introduction (pp. XVI-XVIII), L.N. développe le point de vue que le Karaïsme ne fut pas "fondé" par ANAN, mais existait déjà longtemps avant lui et ne fut que la continuation de l'opposition sadducéenne jamais entièrement étouffée. N'était-ce pas déjà l'opinion même de SA'ADIAH (PINSKER, *Likkute kadmoniyot*, p. 103):

„A cette époque, ANAN et, avec lui, tous les scélérats qui formaient le reste de la bande de SADOQ et de BOËTHOS, rivalisèrent (contre le judaïsme officiel), et résolurent clandestinement de susciter une division, etc.”

„ABRAHAM IBN DAUD (*Chronique*, éd. de NEUBAUER, p. 64) dit de même: „Après la destruction du (deuxième) temple, les Sadducéens déchurent jusqu'à l'arrivée d'ANAN, qui les fortifia”.

„De même les autres auteurs mentionnés par HARKAVY: JUDA HALLÉVI (*Kozari*, III, § 65), ABRAHAM IBN EZRA (*Commentaire du Pentateuque*, Lévi., III, 9; VII, 23; XI, 19, etc.), SAMUEL IBN DJÂMI (*Règles de l'abatage*, écrites en arabe, citées par STEINSCHNEIDER, dans la *Jüd. Zeitschr.*, de GEIGER, I, 241), MAÏMONIDE (*Commentaire sur Abot*, I, 3) et NAHMANIDE (Dans sa lettre connue où il fait l'apologie de Maïmonide, éd. Leipzig, III, f° 8d; cf. *Monatsschr.*, 1860, p. 187”).

„GEIGER a, le premier, établi avec force, dans différentes études, la filiation entre les Sadducéens et les Caraïtes; il a soutenu que la doctrine sadducéenne, qui se distinguait de celle des Pharisiens par ses tendances politiques et hiérarchiques plutôt que religieuses, dut nécessairement disparaître, à la surface, avec la destruction du second temple, mais que les principes en persistèrent, bien qu'avec peine, jusqu'au moment où ils furent rajeunis par les Caraïtes. GEIGER croit même qu'il y avait encore au temps d'ANAN de véritables descendants des Sadducéens, qui durent se rallier volontiers à l'opposition. Quoi qu'il en soit, ANAN trouva là des alliés dans sa lutte contre la loi orale, et c'est pourquoi il put tenter l'aventure et se mettre à la tête d'un schisme nouveau, mais qui était en réalité très ancien. PINSKER

¹) „Early Karaism (The Need for a New Approach)”, *JQR*, N. Series, vol. XL, 1950, pp. 310-311, 315.

Il y a longtemps que les auteurs les plus pénétrants exigent une revision des théories sur le Karaïsme qui dominent presque exclusivement dans le monde savant. En 1908 D. CHWOLSON écrivait (*Das letzte Passamahl Christi* . . ., Leipzig, 1908, pp. 148 et 177) que le Karaïsme n'était pas un déchet de Rabbinnisme, mais rien d'autre que la continuation de la direction conservatrice qui n'a pas accepté les innovations rabbiniques et qui se développait ensuite au cours des siècles et qu'ANAN ne l'a pas „fondé”, mais tous simplement systématisé.

D'ailleurs, de nombreux auteurs refusaient déjà la théorie de la „fondation” du Karaïsme par ANAN et ne le considéraient que comme le continuateur de la doctrine existant depuis les siècles avant lui. Cf. par exemple, J. B. CARPZOVUS, *Introductio in theologiam judaicam*, dans *Pugio Fidei* de R. MARTINUS, Lipsiae, 1687; S. DE SACY, *Chrestomathie Arabe*, tome Ier, Paris, 1826, pp. 323-325; J. BUXTORF, *Synagoga* . . ., Basileae, 1680, p. 2.

trouve aussi ces relations vraisemblables, et même psychologiquement et historiquement nécessaires, et il en donne cette preuve que beaucoup d'auteurs rabbanites regardent également le Karaïsme comme la simple continuation du Sadducéisme".

„Toutefois on pourrait croire que tous ces auteurs rabbanites ont établi une liaison entre les Karaïtes et les Sadducéens par pure haine ou par défaut de jugement historique. Mais on voit que les premiers Karaïtes avaient conscience de cette filiation, et qu'ils parlent des Sadducéens avec respect".

„Mais les rapports entre les Karaïtes et les Sadducéens peuvent encore être établis par des preuves intrinsèques, c'est-à-dire par les nombreuses interprétations législatives communes aux deux sectes".

„La secte sadducéenne, de plus en plus déchue (et de même l'ancienne Halacha devenue caduque), se conserva misérablement chez les Samaritains et se rajeunit au sein du Karaïsme" ¹⁾.

Le terme *Sadducéens* peut provoquer une certaine confusion. Notons que, comme cela fut déjà dit par le R.P. LAGRANGE (*Revue Biblique*, 1912, p. 347 s.) et récemment confirmé par le Prof. A. DUPONT-SOMMER (*Aperçus préliminaires... et Nouveaux Aperçus...*) il ne s'agit pas ici des Sadducéens, en tant qu'un parti politique. Le même nom désignait aussi un autre groupement, n'ayant rien de commun (sauf le nom) avec celui des Sadducéens des Evangiles. C'étaient les Benê-Sadoq représentant le sacerdoce légitime et gardant ses traditions originelles. Ces Benê-Sadoq (qu'on appelle maintenant les Sadocites) ont pris part aux organisations esséniennes comme les communautés de Qoumrân et de Damas, et ont joué un rôle très important dans l'élaboration de leur structure.

A côté de liaisons évidentes avec les Sadocites, L.N. indique certaines analogies entre le Karaïsme primitif et le Chiisme et notamment l'attente messianique, l'ascétisme et le rejet des traditions orales. L.N. ne croit cependant pas que ce soient des emprunts ou des influences chiïtes sur le Karaïsme. Il considère que ces phénomènes sont plus anciens de quelques siècles. Il nous semble que les documents de Qoumrân et de Damas font reculer ces traditions encore plus loin dans le temps. Nous ne répèterons pas ici les preuves irréfutables de la liaison entre la Communauté de Damas et le Karaïsme. D'un autre côté H.-J. SCHOEPS ²⁾ a prouvé l'existence d'une connexion interne étroite dans le développement de la Communauté de Damas, des Esséniens et des Ebionites. Rappelons que déjà RENAN indiquait l'influence exercée sur MAHOMET par les Ebionites. Récemment SCHOEPS ³⁾ est revenu sur ce sujet et a prouvé que „... das Judenchristentum zwar in der christlichen Kirche untergegangen ist, aber im Islam sich konserviert hat und in einigen seiner treibenden Impulse bis in unsere Tage hineinreicht".

¹⁾ Toutes les citations ci-dessus sont tirées de l'article de S. POZNAŃSKI, *Anan et ses écrits*, REJ, vol. XLIV, 1902, pp. 168-174. Cf. aussi RUDOLF LESZYNSKY, *Die Sadduzäer*, Berlin, 1912.

²⁾ „Handelt es sich wirklich um Ebionistische Dokumente?", *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte*, 1951, No. 4, tirage à part, p. 7.

³⁾ ib., *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums*, Tübingen, 1949, p. 342.

Ainsi, il n'y a rien d'étonnant à ce qu'on trouve des analogies avec l'Essénisme aussi bien dans le Karaïsme que dans l'Islam. Ces analogies ne se limitent pas aux principes seulement mais apparaissent aussi dans les usages. Par exemple, le mot *mēcet* est un décalque arabe de *la maison de prostration*, expression par laquelle l'Écrit de Damas désignait le temple. D'un autre côté les prosternations apparaissent souvent dans le service karaïte. J. LEHMANN a démontré que les Esséniens se déchaussaient à l'entrée au temple¹⁾. Le même usage existe chez les musulmans et les karaïtes (Lettre de GUSTAF PERINGER du 14 Novembre 1690). Ainsi on a tout droit de supposer que, aussi bien dans le cas du Karaïsme que dans celui du Chiisme, on a une continuation d'une tradition très ancienne.

Ayant à juste titre rompu avec la théorie rebattue qui considère ANAN comme „fondateur” du Karaïsme, L.N. commence l'histoire de la période nouvelle du Karaïsme, dans le sens strict du mot, à partir de ABŪ 'ĪSĀ DE FAHĀN (fin du VII^e siècle) et de YŪDĠĀN (premier quart du VIII^e siècle). Aucun d'eux n'avait reçu une culture littéraire et, d'après L.N., ANAN seul, en continuant ce mouvement ancien, et, grâce à sa culture, a pu le systématiser.

Ayant examiné l'origine du Karaïsme, L.N. passe ensuite à un aperçu de sa propagation à l'époque de son expansion la plus puissante. Ici, sans apporter de preuve, il affirme que le Karaïsme n'a fait de propagande que dans des cercles très limités, n'a pas eu de succès parmi les intellectuels et n'a pu convertir aucun personnage important.

Il est vrai que les restes insignifiants des communautés karaïtes à l'heure présente ne peuvent pas donner d'indications sur leur extension ancienne. Dans un autre endroit²⁾ nous avons fait quelques remarques insuffisantes et sans ordre sur la propagation spontanée du Karaïsme parmi les différents peuples. Ses succès ne se limitaient pas aux masses mais gagnaient des prosélytes parmi l'élite; au Xe siècle, même le chef religieux de tous les karaïtes fut un converti, DAVID MOKAMMÈS.

Si, comme L.N. l'écrit, au Xe siècle l'insuccès de l'action missionnaire karaïte était déjà évident, pourquoi alors, juste à ce moment, SA'ADIAH L-FAYYŪMĪ a-t-il commencé ses attaques violentes contre elle? Cela serait tout-à-fait contraire à la tactique de son camp, qui, comme dit SCHOEPS (*Theologie*, p. 21) „... Ketzner nicht zu widerlegen oder als abschreckendes Beispiel hinzustellen neigt, sondern zu der wirksameren Waffe des Tot-schweigens greift”.

Pourtant L.N. lui-même dit (pp. XXI et 124) que, précisément au milieu du Xe siècle, de nouvelles communautés karaïtes ont été créées

¹⁾ „Les sectes juives mentionnées dans la Mischna de Berakhot et de Meguilla”, *REJ*, vol. XXX, 1895, pp. 190 et 192.

Il est à noter que les auteurs des *Psaumes de Salomon*, considérés comme oeuvre des Esséniens, exigent aussi un déchaussement à l'entrée au temple (*Les Psaumes de Salomon* . . ., par J. VITEAU, Paris, 1911, pp. 256-257). Le Talmud défend de s'en revêtir revêtu de vêtements blancs et déchaussé.

²⁾ *Note sur la structure sociale des Karaïtes dans les pays arabes*, *Actes du même Congrès*.

dans les Balkans et en Espagne. Donc à cette époque, le mouvement karaïte n'était pas si faible, puisque, pour s'opposer à lui, JEHUDA IB EZRA, favori du roi ALPHONSE VII de Castille, eut recours aux méthodes les plus violentes qui ont tragiquement mis fin à l'existence des Karaïtes en Espagne ¹⁾.

Encore au XIXe et au début du XXe siècles, c'est-à-dire à l'époque de sa décadence culturelle la plus profonde, le Karaïsme eut suffisamment de force attractive pour se propager spontanément parmi la population slave de l'Europe Orientale. Les karaïtes eux-mêmes n'ont pas contribué à cela par le moindre effort missionnaire. Mis devant le fait accompli, ils se sont bornés à la publication pour les convertis d'un recueil de prières en russe ²⁾.

A. NIEMOJEWSKI (Notes à l'édition polonaise de *La vie de Jésus* par RENAN. Je cite de mémoire) écrivait que le Karaïsme possédait toutes les données pour se développer à un échelle universelle, mais qu'il préféré se renfermer en Crimée et se transformer en une secte insignifiante. Quelles sont les causes de ce phénomène? Comment s'explique l'histoire du Karaïsme? On ne peut pas encore le dire. Une préface comme celle de L.N. et une recension comme celle-ci ne peuvent en traiter, même superficiellement.

Après cet aperçu historique, L.N. passe à l'examen de la théologie. Sa tendance personnelle est de réduire l'importance et le rôle du Karaïsme. Selon L.N. il manquerait d'originalité dans ses dogmes, il ne présenterait que formalisme et littéralisme, bornant son intérêt aux seules questions cultuelles, avec abandon des questions morales; la littérature karaïte serait sèche et polémique (pp. VIII et XXIII).

Sans pouvoir traiter à fond cette question, disons que tous ceux qui, même superficiellement, connaissent la littérature karaïte, savent que les questions morales y occupent une place suffisamment importante („Leur morale est pure" — BASNAGE, *L'Histoire et la Religion des Juifs*, tome Ier, Rotterdam, 1707, p. 457). D'ailleurs, dans l'Anthologie même, les passages consacrés aux questions morales n'occupent pas la dernière place. Ensuite, il faut tenir compte que les ouvrages polémiques sont toujours les plus individuels et qu'on a moins de difficultés à déterminer leur origine. Par contre, même avec la meilleure volonté, il est parfois impossible d'identifier l'origine d'ouvrages d'intérêt général. Les manuscrits des ouvrages karaïtes ont actuellement presque complètement échappé aux mains des karaïtes mêmes. Y a-t-il une chose plus facile que de faire disparaître les preuves de paternité au moyen de la destruction accidentelle ou non d'un feuillet ou seulement d'une fraction de feuillet? Ainsi l'ouvrage devient anonyme et va au „trésor spirituel commun".

¹⁾ CHWOLSON, *o.c.*, p. 148, note; ib., *Die Blutanklage* . . ., Frankfurt a. M., 1901, p. 341; S. DUBNOW, *Die Geschichte* . . ., Berlin, n. d., Band IV, p. 354; H. GRAETZ, *Geschichte* . . ., Leipzig, n. d., Sechster Band, pp. 80, 159; A. A. NEUMAN, *The Jews in Spain*, vol. II, Philadelphia, 1944, p. 240; ZUNZ, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, Frankfurt a.M., 1892, p. 440, note.

²⁾ *Glas Jakova*, rédigé par P. MAŁECKI, Vilno, 1910, in 12°, vol. I, XXXIV + 484 pages; vol. II, 369 pages.

Ajoutons que les Karaïtes n'ont publié eux-mêmes que peu d'ouvrages de leur groupe. Dans la plupart des cas, les éditeurs ont été des personnes dont l'objectivité a pu être suspectée. Quel miracle s'ils n'ont fait connaître que la production karaïte de moindre valeur et sous quelle forme!

Ce n'est pas, semble-t-il, pour flatter les Karaïtes que SCHECHTER ¹⁾ lui, ayant découvert la Geniza du Caire, connaissait par conséquent de première main les documents karaïtes, écrivait que le Karaïsme „had also the blessed effect of giving a wholesome impetus to the study of the Bible, which resulted in producing a school of Grammarians and Exegets, and perhaps also of Massoretes, such as Judaism had never seen before”. D'ailleurs, c'est L.N. même qui écrivait autrefois ²⁾ que la contribution karaïte au trésor commun „fut réellement très importante et de grande valeur”.

En ce qui concerne les reproches de manque d'originalité du Karaïsme, on peut seulement dire que l'état actuel de décadence et d'oubli de l'héritage spirituel ne peut pas permettre un vrai jugement. Pourtant, nous nous permettrons de poser cette question: si les auteurs karaïtes ne possédaient aucune idée proprement originale, s'ils les empruntaient à droite et à gauche, n'importe qui et ne détenaient qu'un moule d'idées sans cohésion, pourquoi leur doctrine a-t-elle eu autrefois un tel succès?

Hâtons-nous de dire que, malgré ces quelques défauts, l'introduction, quoique courte, est vraiment solide et intéressante. L'auteur la termine par un souhait auquel on ne peut que souscrire: que les recherches postérieures découvrent les causes de la chute si profonde du Karaïsme après une période initiale si pleine de promesses!

Dans l'Anthologie proprement dite, l'auteur donne plus de 300 pages de textes dans une traduction parfaite, munie d'un riche appareil scientifique (notes, bibliographie, index).

Il est à regretter que L.N., vu le manque de sources originales, n'ait pas cité les extraits des auteurs arabes, qui parlent des précurseurs d'ANAN. Cela donnerait une base plus large à la compréhension de l'essence et de l'histoire du Karaïsme ³⁾.

Les extraits tirés de chaque auteur sont précédés d'une rapide esquisse biographique et critique, qui fixe l'époque brièvement et clairement.

L.N. commence par le Livre des préceptes d'ANAN, à la personnalité et aux oeuvres de qui un long passage est consacré. Ensuite, à travers BENJAMIN AL-NAHĀWANDĪ et DANIEL AL-ḲŪMISĪ on arrive à YA'ḲŪB AL-ḲIRḲISĀNĪ que L.N. connaît à fond. Puis viennent les ouvrages théologiques d'auteurs variés qui touchent les différents problèmes.

Il est à regretter que L.N. se soit peu attaché à la législation matrimoniale

¹⁾ *Inaugural address* . . . Delivered November 20, 1902, New York, 1903, p. 13; cf. aussi H. HIRSCHFELD, *Qirḡisāni Studies*, London, 1918, pp. 31-32.

²⁾ *Early Karaism*, p. 314. Cf. aussi l'article de L. N., *Karaïtes* dans *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, vol. 6 (1948), p. 318.

³⁾ Dans son autre article (*Yivo Bleter*, vol. XXXIII, New York, tirage à part, 1948, p. 108). L. N. n'apprécie guère les sources arabes en cette matière, on ne sait pas si c'est à juste titre.

karâite, dont les sources, comme CHWOLSON¹⁾ l'a indiqué, nous conduisent à une époque très reculée. CHWOLSON a révélé une parenté très proche même une quasi-identité entre ces lois et les lois matrimoniales chrétienne et l'explique par le fait que les deux religions ont puisé à une source commune, c'est-à-dire à l'ancienne législation sadocite. Pour condamner polygamie, qui est tolérée par la Bible, on s'appuie sur le verset qui défend d'épouser la soeur de sa femme; on étend le sens du mot soeur à toutes les coreligionnaires²⁾. Le divorce est limité et, contrairement aux lois bibliques, la femme en a aussi l'initiative³⁾. La chasteté dans les règles karâïtes de la vie conjugale rappelle les usages esséniens⁴⁾.

Tous ces sujets mériteraient qu'on leur consacrait plus d'espace, qu'on pourrait gagner sur le reste. On pourrait par exemple supprimer une partie des textes d'ELIJAH BAŠYATCHI (le dernier dans la série chronologique des auteurs), auquel L.N. a attribué trop d'importance. Il est vrai que BAŠYATCHI fut un théologien influent, mais il avait beaucoup perdu du sentiment et de la compréhension du Karaïsme primitif et il est, en majeure partie, responsable de la perte de son antique originalité⁵⁾.

Parmi ces auteurs essentiellement théologiques, des extraits de la chronique de IBN-AL-HITĪ et de l'autobiographie de MOÏSE DE DAMAS sont intercalés. Les ouvrages poétiques sont représentés par M. DARĪ. La traduction rend avec toute la finesse désirable ses vers et il faut regretter qu'on ait consacré si peu de place à cet auteur de talent.

Le recueil se termine par des fragments de la liturgie. Il faut noter que le service karâite est très long. Dans certaines périodes, aux deux services ordinaires (du matin et du soir), on ajoute des prières supplémentaires avant le service du soir, ou encore on fait des services nocturnes. Il existe plusieurs rites. Celui qui est en vigueur actuellement fut imprimé pour la première fois en deux volumes à Venise chez DAN. BOMBERG en 1528-29 („Tantae autem raritatis est editio . . .”, — J. B. DE ROSSI, *Annales Hebraeo-Typographici*, Parmae, 1799, p. 32). La dernière édition, la plus systématique et la plus complète, parut à Vilno (1891-92) en quatre grands volumes. Il y a quelques années, on en a publié une reproduction photographique au Caire.

Le choix des prières (rite complet du mariage et quelques hymnes et prières séparées) ne nous semble pas être très heureux. Il eût fallu se limiter aux prières originales. Quel sens peut avoir la publication de textes empruntés à d'autres auteurs ou même de psaumes?

¹⁾ *Das letzte Passamahl* . . ., p. 176. Pour tous ces problèmes, voir plus de précision dans notre article *La Communauté de la Nouvelle Alliance et le Karaïsme*.

²⁾ POZNAŃSKI, *o.c.*, *REJ*, vol. XLV, pp. 185-186.

³⁾ Il est à noter que la communauté d'Eléphantine attribuait aussi à la femme l'initiative du divorce. (Communication de M. L'Abbé H. CAZELLES à l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, le 17 Décembre 1954; cf. aussi S. W. BARON, *The Jewish Community* . . ., vol. I, Philadelphia, 1945, p. 70).

⁴⁾ Cf. POZNAŃSKI, *o.c.*, p. 194, où il cite l'opinion du Rabbin YEHOUDA IBN BALÂM qui discute les exigences karâïtes de chasteté et ironise à ce sujet.

⁵⁾ GRAETZ, *o.c.*, *Achter Band*, pp. 208-209, 274-277. Cf. aussi notre note „Une visite au Caire”, *VT*, IV, p. 202.

Il est dommage que l'auteur n'ait pas consacré une place plus large au service nocturne, si caractéristique du Karaïsme (vol. III). Dans les volumes I et IV on trouve les cantiques de deuil et les prières commémoratives. Certaines, parmi ces dernières, possèdent une valeur historique, car elles contiennent beaucoup de noms de personnages importants. Le vol. I contient les prières supplémentaires pour les périodes précédant la Pentecôte et les jeûnes, qui eux aussi, mériteraient l'attention.

Il eût fallu donner une idée du rite de Damas, distinct de celui qui est actuellement en vigueur (manuscrit du British Museum, un fragment publié par G. MARGOLIOUTH, *JQR*, XVIII, 1906, 505-527.)

Dans l'Introduction, L.N. écrivait: „Our present knowledge of early Karaism is thus woefully inadequate”, „Modern critical study of Karaite history and theology is as yet in its infancy”, „The embryonic state of Karaite studies and the difficulties attending them have attracted few students to this field...”.

L'ouvrage de L.N. contribuera sans doute à réveiller l'intérêt pour ces études, dont l'importance pour l'histoire générale des religions ne doit pas être négligée. Il ne nous reste qu'à souhaiter au livre de L.N. d'être le premier d'une série d'autres anthologies consacrées aux problèmes particuliers du Karaïsme.

S. SZYSZMAN

BOOK LIST ¹⁾

- W. F. ALBRIGHT, *The Bible after twenty years of Archeology* (1932-1952), Biblica Colloquium, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 1954. Reprinted from *Religion in Life*, 1952. 18 p. \$ 0.75.
- D. BARTHÉLEMY and J. T. MILIK, with contributions by R. DE VAUX, G. M. CROWFOOT, H. J. PLENDERLEITH and G. L. HARDING, *Qumran Cave I. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert I*. Oxford, Univ. Press, xi + 165 pp., with 37 Plates. Price (in U.K.) 63 s. net.
- This first volume of a series on the mss. and discoveries in the Judaean desert. Part I: the archaeological finds. Part II: the texts. Indexes of biblical references and of Hebrew and Aramaic words. A splendid edition.
- R. E. BROWN, *The sensus plenior of sacred scripture*, thesis of St. Mary's University, Baltimore, 1955. xiv + 161 pp. Price \$ 2.00.
- R. CRIADO, *La teología de la historia en el Antiguo Testamento*, Madrid, 1954. 45 pp.
- J. KLAUSNER, *The Messianic idea in Israel*, McMillan, New York 1955. xv + 543 pp. \$ 7.50.
- I. MENDELSON, ed., *Religions of the Ancient Near East, Sumero-Akkadian Religious Texts and Ugaritic Epics* New York, The Liberal Arts Press 1955. xxix + 284 pp. Translations by KRAMER, SPEISER, SACHS, STEPHENS, PFEIFFER, MENDELSON and GINSBERG.
- G. E. MENDENHALL, *Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East*, Biblical Colloquium, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 1955. Reprinted from *The Biblical Archaeologist*, 1954. 50 pp. \$ 1.00.
- S. MOSCATI, *Il sistema consonantico delle lingue semitiche*, Roma 1954. 75 pp.
- J. M. MYERS, *The linguistic and literary form of the Book of Ruth*, Leiden, Brill 1955. x + 69 pp. Price Dutch florins 10.—
- A. NEHER, *L'essence du Prophétisme*, Paris, Presses universitaires de France, 1955. 359 pp.
- H. M. ORLINSKY, *Ancient Israel*, Cornell Univ. Press, Ithaca, N. Y. 1954. xii + 193 pp.
- A very well written brief account of the history of ancient Israel for the general reader.
- M. H. POPE, *El in the Ugaritic texts*, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, Vol. II, Leiden Brill 1955. x + 116 pp. Price Dutch florins 14.— (For subscribers of *V.T.* Dutch fl. 11.—).
- H. H. ROWLEY, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and their Significance*, London Independent Press Ltd, 1955. 24 pp., 2 s.
- Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* xviii-xix, 1953-1954. Lund 1955. 221 pp. O. T. articles of KAPELRUD, LINDHAGEN, BLACK and GÄRTNER; reviews of ENGNELL.
- M. TSEVAT, *A study of the language of the Biblical Psalms*, Society of Biblical Literature, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 1955. viii + 153 pp. (typewritten). *JBL* Monographs Series, Vol. IX.
- A thorough investigation.

¹⁾ The mention of books in this list neither simplifies nor precludes subsequent review at length.

ETYMOLOGISCHE UNTERSUCHUNGEN AUF GRUND DES PALAESTINISCHEN ARABISCH

VON

JOSUA BLAU

Jerusalem

Prof. P. Kahle zum achtzigsten Geburtstag.

Bereits die jüdischen Bibelexegeten des arabischen Mittelalters haben den so reichen Wortschatz des klassischen Arabisch zur Erklärung schwieriger Bibelstellen herangezogen und seit den Tagen von Qurajš's hat eine immer wachsende Zahl von Gelehrten dunkle biblische Wörter auf Grund von arabischen gedeutet und, wie es scheint, gar manchmal sogar über 's Ziel geschossen. In ihrem Überflusse haben so manche Forscher sich von sekundären Bedeutungen arabischer Wörter irreleiten lassen oder sich auf die Angaben der arabischen Nationallexikographen ohne jegliche Nachprüfung verlassen ¹⁾. Bloss die so sehr erwartete Ausgabe eines wissenschaftlichen arabischen Wörterbuches wird, wie zu erhoffen, diesem Übelstand ein Ende bereiten.

In viel geringerem Mass hingegen wurde der Wortschatz der arabischen Dialekte zur Erklärung des biblischen Wortschatzes herangezogen. Zwar haben bereits die mittelalterlichen jüdischen Bibelexegeten des arabischen Sprachkreises Bibelstellen auf Grund von Wörtern, die ihren arabischen Mundarten eigen waren, erklärt ²⁾, die moderne Forschung hat jedoch die arabischen Dialekte verhältnismässig recht wenig beachtet, wenn wir absehen von den Arbeiten C. v. LANDBERGS und dem Vergleich des palästinischen Arabisch, das wegen seiner mit dem AT gemeinsamen Heimat besondere Beachtung fand. Aber selbst diese Mundart wurde nicht systematisch zum Studium der Etymologie des biblischen Wortschatzes herangezogen. In diesem Artikel, der fast zur Gänze ³⁾ auf dem arabischen Bauerndialekt Mittelpalästinas basiert, wie er uns in den *Volks-erzählungen aus Palästina*, gesammelt ... und ... herausgegeben von

¹⁾ Vergleiche darüber zum Beispiel L. KOPF in *L'šōnēnū* (hebräisch), 1954, 72 ff.

²⁾ Vergleiche zum Beispiel weiter 'tm.

³⁾ Ausnahmen: *ṭwš*, *qr^c*.

H. SCHMIDT und P. KAHLE, 1918/30¹⁾ vorliegt, wird der Versuch gemacht aufzuzeigen, welche wichtige Ergebnisse die systematische Durcharbeitung des vulgärarabischen Sprachschatzes für die Erhellung der etymologischen Zusammenhänge im Biblischen zeitigen kann: und wir hoffen, dass die arabischen Dialektologen sich in nicht allzuferner Zukunft dieser Aufgabe unterziehen werden.

Hier muss jedoch eine wichtige Einschränkung gemacht werden: diese etymologischen Untersuchungen müssen nicht nur von Kennern des betreffenden Dialektes unternommen werden, sie müssen auch unter ständiger Vergleichung des klassischen Arabisch und der anderen arabischen Mundarten vor sich gehen. Sonst besteht die Gefahr, dass wir uns auf eine sekundäre Bedeutung verlassen, die ein Wort in einem gewissen Zusammenhange angenommen hat. Wir dürfen hier nicht in dieselben Fehler verfallen, die bei der Heranziehung des klassischen Arabisch gemacht worden sind, wir dürfen nicht in den Wörtersammlungen der diversen Dialekte blättern und Wurzeln „finden“, die biblischen „entsprechen“, ohne zu untersuchen, ob nicht diese „parallele“ Bedeutung eine sekundäre Entwicklung eines aus dem Schriftarabisch oder einem anderen arabischen Dialekt wohlbekannten Wortes ist. Wie gross die Möglichkeit eines Irrtums ist, das möge folgendes typische Beispiel zeigen²⁾:

SK 89, 4 *qām iṭṭēr iṭṭall iqarqi' ta-waqā' fi qā' ihwād umāt* wird übersetzt: Und der Vogel rollte hinunter, bis er in die Talsohle fiel und starb. Auf den ersten Blick hat es den Anschein, dass wir eine schlagende Parallele zum biblischen *qarqa'* Grund, Boden gefunden haben:

¹⁾ Abgekürzt: SK; die Zahlen bezeichnen die Erzählungen und die in ihnen gezählten Abschnitte. Wenn keine Zahlen angeführt, so ist das Wort im Glossar am Ende des zweiten Bandes aufzusuchen. Weitere Abkürzungen:

BARTHÉLEMY, (A.), *Dictionnaire Arabe-Français, Dialectes de Syrie . . .*, 1935 sq).

BAUER, (L.), *Wörterbuch des palästinischen Arabisch, Deutsch-Arabisch*, 1933).

BEAUSSIER, (M.), *Dictionnaire Arabe-Français*, 1931 [Dialekte von Tunis, Algier]).

KAMPPMEYER, (G.), *Glossar zu den 5000 arabischen Sprichwörtern aus Palästina* MSOS, Beiband zu Jahrgang xxxviii).

LANDBERG, (C.), *Hadramout* (1901). Idem, *Daṭīnah*, (1905-13). Idem, *Glos (saïre) Daṭīnois* (1920-42). Idem (*Glossaire de la langue des Bédouins*) 'Anazeh (1940).

SPIRO, (S.), *Arabic-English vocabulary of the colloquial Arabic of Egypt*, 1895).

Ferner die bekannten Bibelwörterbücher GESENIUS-BUHL (¹⁷), GESENIUS-BROWN-(DRIVER-BRIGGS), KÖHLER-(BAUMGARTNER), ebenso BEN-YEHUDA, (*The saurus totius Hebraïtatis*).

Die bekannten arabischen Wörterbücher von BUSTĀNI, (B., *Muḥiṭ al-muḥiṭ*) DOZY, HAVA (∞ bezeichnet, dass das Wort aus dem syrischen Vulgärdialekt stammt), die neuarabischen Wörterbücher für die Schriftsprache der Gegenwart von WEHR, (H.) und AJJALON, (D. — SINAR, P., arabisch-hebräisch).

²⁾ Vergleiche auch Seite 340, Anmerkung 2 zu *dāgar*.

denn *qarqa'* rollte hinunter scheint ein aus dem Nomen *qarqa'* „Grund“ denominiertes Verbum zu sein. Ein Vergleich mit dem Mittel- und Neu-Arabisch belehrt uns jedoch eines besseren: In Wirklichkeit ist das arabische *qarqa'* ein schallnachahmendes Zeitwort ¹⁾ in der Bedeutung „lärmen, klappern“ (s. DOZY, HAVA, WEHR, AJJALON, KAMPPFMEYER s.v., BAUER s.v. klappern) und wörtlich übersetzt lautet unsere Stelle: Und der Vogel verursachte (während er hinunterrollte) Lärm, bis er...

Wir bringen hier in alphabetischer Reihenfolge die hebräischen Wörter, die eine Parallele im palästinischen Arabisch haben:

bhl: *nīḥal* erschreckt werden, sich beeilen. BARTH, *Etymologische Studien* 30, verglich es mit arabisch *wahila* erschreckt werden und nahm eine unregelmässige Entsprechung *b - w* an; LANDBERG, *Ḥaḍramout* 108, zog arabisch *balīḥa*, modern-nordarabisch *bhl*, südliches Neu-arabisch *bhl* dumm sein heran, trotz des Bedeutungsunterschiedes. Eine sowohl der Bedeutung wie auch der Form nach ansprechende Parallele bietet *inbahar* SK 46, 15 erstaunt, geblendet sein, vergleiche auch HAVA < s.v. Die ursprüngliche Bedeutung ist vielleicht in klassisch-arabischen *inbahara* „atemlos sein“ erhalten. Von dieser Bedeutung mögen sich dann erschrecken (hebr., aram. *bhl*), erstaunen (modern-arabisch *bbr*), eilen (hebr. aram. *bhl*) und wohl auch ruhen, aufhören (syrisch *bhl*) entwickelt haben. Über den Wechsel *l - r* vergleiche zum Beispiel GESENIUS-BUHL s.v. 3, ferner LANDBERG, *Daḡīna* über 1765 den Wechsel von *inbahar* und *inbahal*, allerdings in anderer Bedeutung ²⁾.

baqbūq Flasche, wurde schon längst als onomatopoetisches Wort erkannt. Eine weitere schlagende Parallele bietet SK 123, 16 *dalaqu ḥalḡarra* ... *uqāmat ḥadī tbaḡbiq* sie gossen den Krug aus ... und der gurgelte, vergleiche dieselbe Bedeutung im klassischen Arabisch bei Ibn Sa'd, zitiert von BROCKELMANN, *Lexicon Syriacum*²⁾, s.v. *baqbūga*.

ḡdīlīm gedrehte Fäden. GESENIUS-BUHL, GESENIUS-BROWN und KÖHLER vergleichen alle aram. *ḡdīlta* Flechte und arab. *ḡadala* fest drehen; hier ist jedoch auch zu erwähnen arab. *ḡadīl* gedrehter Strick (vgl. auch BEN YEHUDA s.v.) und neuarabisch (s. SK, BARTHÉLEMY, SPIRO und DOZY) *ḡadīla* Zopf.

dāqar durchbohren: neben der aramäischen Entsprechung zitiert KÖHLER *daqar* aus LANDBERG, *Glos. Daḡīnois* 813, s. auch BROCKELMANN,

¹⁾ So gegen LANDBERG, *Glos. Daḡīnois* 2485, der FRANZ DELITZSCH folgt.

²⁾ In dieser Form allerdings hat auch der Einfluss des *n* mitgewirkt.

*Lexicon Syriacum*² s.v.; dieses Verbum ist fast über den ganzen neu-arabischen Sprachkreis verbreitet¹): es findet sich in der Bedeutung „verletzen“ in Syrien (BARTHÉLEMY), in der Bedeutung „anstossen“²) in Palästina (SK, KAMPPMEYER), Syrien (BARTHÉLEMY), Ägypten (SPIRO *daqqar* to press one thing against another, eigentlich wohl: sie aneinanderstossen machen) und in Nordafrika (DOZY), in der Bedeutung „ärgern“³) in Palästina (SK) und Syrien (BUSTĀNĪ).

hittēl, *hētēl* täuschen, verspotten. Die Meinungen sind geteilt, ob wir diese Formen der Wurzel *tll* oder *htl* zuweisen sollen und wie das Verhältnis dieser beiden Wurzel ist. Während die mittelalterlichen jüdischen Exegeten und in ihren Fussstapfen BEN YEHUDA s.v. *htl*, die Wurzel *tll* gar nicht anerkennen und selbst Formen wie *hētallū* von *htl* ableiten, sehen heute die meisten (so GESENIUS-BUHL, GESENIUS-BROWN, KÖHLER, BERGSTRÄSSER, *Hebr. Grammatik* II, § 19k, Anm.) in *htl* ein sekundäres, aus dem *hifʿil* von *tll* gebildetes Verbum. Andere wieder (so GESENIUS-KAUTZSCH²⁷, § 67^v, KÖNIG, *Lehrgebäude* II 352, BAUER-LEANDER, *Hist. Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache* 439) erkennen bloss die Wurzel *tll* an und leiten selbst *wajhattel* (|| *wajhassēb*, statt *wajjassēb*) von ihr ab. Dagegen hat A. D. SINGER, *JQR* N.S. XXXVI⁴) bloss die Wurzel *htl* anerkannt, hält die abweichenden Formen für Vokalisationsfehler und vokalisiert überall! *htl* entsprechend. Auch uns scheint *htl* die primäre Wurzel zu sein; dies erklärt uns, warum in Formen wie *jʿhatēllu* das *h* immer erhalten bleibt⁵): nachdem Formen wie *hittalti*, ursprünglich *piʿēl* von *htl*, als *hifʿil* von *tll* umgedeutet worden sind (vergleiche Formen wie *jiddmū*, *wajjak-kefūm* u.s.w. mit Verdoppelung des ersten Radikals, ohne Verdoppelung des zweiten) wurde auch *wajhattel* (|| *wajhassēb*, statt *wajjassēb*)

¹) Es ist daher nicht mit BARTHÉLEMY als syrisches Lehnwort anzusehen.

²) Das syrisch-palästinische *daqqar* steckenbleiben (KAMPPMEYER, BAUER s. v. steckenbleiben), aufhalten (BARTHÉLEMY, HAVA) ist zwar wahrscheinlich nicht mit BARTHÉLEMY von *daqʿr* Riegel denominiert, ist aber eine sekundäre Entwicklung der Bedeutung „anstossen“, vergleiche das bei KAMPPMEYER zitierte Sprichwort *daqqarat issikka* der Pflug blieb stecken, erklärt: „Ursprünglich von dem Fellachen, dessen Pflugschar an einen Stein anstösst“. Da also diese Bedeutung sekundär ist, kann Thr. iv 9 *mʿduqqārim mittʿnūbōt šādaj* nicht als „gehindert vom Ertrage des Feldes“ aufgefasst werden (gegen G. R. DRIVER, *Bertholetfestchrift* 141; der etymologische Zusammenhang mit dem dort zitierten *daqa* Garten, *dawqara* unfruchtbare Ebene zwischen zwei Bergen — ist unklar).

³) Vergleiche auch DELCOR, *RB* 58, 193, dessen Erklärung ich mich allerdings nicht anschliessen mag.

⁴) Ich danke S. A. LOEWENSTAMM, der mich auf diesen Artikel aufmerksam gemacht hat.

⁵) So schon SINGER, *loc. cit.*, der betont, wie selten *h* in solchen Formen erhalten bleibt. Ähnlich bereits BERGSTRÄSSER, *loc. cit.*

ls von *tll* gebildet empfunden, das *b* blieb jedoch, der ursprünglichen Wurzel *htl* gemäss, erhalten. Dass *tll* keine blosser Erfindung der Punktatoren ist, beweist der Umstand, dass es einmal auch im Kononantentext erhalten ist: הותל Jes. xlv 20. Die Grundbedeutung der Wurzel *htl*-*tll* scheint „lügen“ zu sein (Ri. xvi 10, 13 || *dibber keṣābīm*, *yahṭallōt* Jes. xxx 10 || *ḥlaqōt*), woraus sich dann die Bedeutung potten entwickelt hat ¹⁾. Diese Wurzel *htl* findet sich ebenfalls im *ḥēl* und mit der Präposition *b* ²⁾ verbunden (!) in einer bloss leicht modifizierten Bedeutung (lügen > seine Pflicht nicht erfüllen > vernachlässigen) in Palästina ³⁾ (SK, KAMPFFMEYER, BAUER s.v. nachlässig) ⁴⁾; der Umstand, dass sowohl Stammform wie Präposition übereinstimmen, scheint wohl eine zufällige Übereinstimmung auszuschliessen und wir dürfen im palästinischen *htl* einen weiteren Beweis für die Ursprünglichkeit von *htl* im Hebräischen sehen ⁵⁾.

ṣāraq: Hos. vii 9 *gam šēḥā ṣāraqā bō* ⁶⁾ erklärt GESENIUS-BUHL „auch das Alter hat ihn beschlichen“, auf Grund des syrischen Vulgärarabisch *ṣrq* sich heimlich einschleichen. Diese Bedeutung findet sich auch im palästinischen (SK) und ägyptischen (SPIRO escape, dart) Vulgärarabisch, ferner in Nordafrika (BEAUSSIER, 2. und insbesondere 5. Stammform).

ḥārad: zittern. GESENIUS-BUHL, GESENIUS-BROWN, KÖHLER vergleichen klassisch-arabisch *ḥarida* verschämt sein, BEN YEHUDA auch *ḥarida* zürnen, das sich auch in SK findet. Dies letztere scheint mir semantisch näher zu liegen, vergleiche *rāgaṣ*, das ebenfalls beide Bedeutungen vereinigt.

¹⁾ Hat SINGER mit seiner geistreichen Erklärung recht, *htl* sei ursprünglich eine infingierte t-Form von *hll*, vergleiche aramäisch *abel*, *ettahal* spotten, dann müssten wir „spotten“ als Grundbedeutung annehmen.

²⁾ *fī*, das sich neben *bi* bei SK nach *battal* findet, ist als blosser Variante von *bi* anzusehen, wie so häufig im Neo-Arabischen, vergleiche zum Beispiel BROCKELMANN, *Grundriss* II, 373. Auch das akkusativische Pronominalsuffix nach *battal* bei KAMPFFMEYER ist wohl als Ersatz für *bi* anzusehen, vergleiche BROCKELMANN, *p. cit.*, 319/20, insbesondere im lapidaren Stil des Sprichwortes und im Reim zu einem Verb mit Pronominalsuffix.

³⁾ Es ist keine Entlehnung anzunehmen, da ja *htl* im Hebräischen durch *tll* verdrängt worden ist, wie zum Beispiel die Punktation von Formen wie **ḥātēllū* (also von *tll*) beweist, die ja auch nach *htl* (also **ḥattēllū*) hätte vokalisiert werden können.

⁴⁾ Es beruht wohl auf einem Zufall, wenn sowohl Gen. xxxi 7 wie auch SK 54, 2 vom schändlichen Verhalten des Onkels gegenüber dem Neffen die Rede ist.

⁵⁾ Da ja *htl*, siehe Anmerkung 3, im palästinischen Arabisch kein Lehnwort sein kann, wenn wir mit der Annahme Recht haben, dass im späteren Bibelhebräisch *htl* von *tll* verdrängt worden ist.

⁶⁾ Eine andere ansprechende Erklärung ist die von G. R. DRIVER, *JTS* 30, 38, *ṣāraq* nach arabisch *aṣraq*, aramäisch *ṣrq* im Sinne von „hell sein“ zu verstehen.

tāš: schweben im Fluge, vergleiche KAMPFFMEYER *tāš* (*u*) obenauf schwimmen ¹⁾).

jahīr: stolz, übermütig. GESENIUS-BROWN, KÖHLER vergleichen klassisch-arabisch *istajhara* toll sein, GESENIUS-BUHL mit NÖLDEKE *wbr* erglänzen. Genau entsprechen SK *wabra* Erhabenheit, BUSTĀNĪ *ḏū wabra* geehrt, SK *ōhar* schrecklicher, SPIRO, WEHR *wabra* Schrecken. Gleich biblischen *gʾj* vereint also diese Wurzel die Bedeutungen Erhabenheit und Übermut.

kefir: junger Löwe. Dieses Wort, das etymologisch isoliert (siehe die Wörterbücher) schien, ist mit *ḡafr* zu vergleichen ²⁾, im klassischen Arabisch vier Monate altes Lamm, SK *ḡafr ilghaxāl* junge Gazelle. Das Wort bedeutete ursprünglich wohl „junges Tier“, vergleiche *ḡūr*.

mēṣaḥ: Stirn. KÖHLER schlägt vor, dies Wort von *ṣḥḥ* glänzen abzuleiten ³⁾; vergleiche damit die gleiche semantische Entwicklung glänzen > Stirn von klassisch-arabisch *ṣabaḥa* strahlen, *ṣabāḥ* Morgen, irakisch-beduinisch *ṣabḥa* (BARTHÉLEMY) weißer Stirnfleck bei Pferden, palästinisch *ṣabāḥ* (SK, KAMPFFMEYER, BAUER s.v. Stirn) Stirn.

māraq: reiben, polieren, vergleiche SK *marāḡ* reiben ⁴⁾.

mātōq: süß; die Wörterbücher vergleichen klassisch-arabisch *tamaṭṭaq* mit Wohlgefallen schnalzen (mit *t* für *ṭ* vor *q*). Das *t* ist jedoch erhalten (oder durch Dissimilation ⁵⁾ wieder hergestellt) SK *ubū j-mattiq fība*: indem er sie mit Wohlbehagen abküsste (aber BAUER s.v. schnalzen *itmaṭṭaq*).

neʿtam: Dies Hapax legomenon Jes. ix 18 wurde von den mittelalterlichen jüdisch-arabischen Exegeten auf Grund des in ihrem Munde geläufigen arabischen *ʿtm* als „dunkel werden“ gedeutet, wie

¹⁾ Diese Parallele ist weit natürlicher, als *tāša* Ziel verfehlen, *tāʾiš*, *tajjāš* unbeständig, wie BROCKELMANN, *Lexicon Syriacum*² s.v. *twš* annimmt, siehe auch KÖHLER. Arabisch *twš* (so GESENIUS-BUHL) weicht von der normalen Entsprechung der Zischlaute ab.

²⁾ Über den Wechsel *g* - *k* vergleiche arabisch *ḡabada*, hebräisch *kibēd*, ferner die Bibelwörterbücher s.v. *g*, LANDBERG, *Glos. Daḡinois* 257/8.

³⁾ In diesem Fall müssen wir annehmen, dass durch etymologische Verdunkelung *mēṣaḥ* in die Klasse der Segolata übergetreten ist (also ursprünglich *mēšāḥ*, dann *mēṣaḥ*, vergleiche *kōbāʿ*, in status constructus *kōbāʿ*).

⁴⁾ Über den Wechsel *g* - *q* vergleiche die Bibelwörterbücher s.v. *g*, LANDBERG, *Glos. Daḡinois* 257. Nach ZIMMERN (zitiert bei BROCKELMANN, *Lexicon Syriacum*², s.v. *mrq*) ist dieses Wort aus dem Akkadischen entlehnt und in diesem Falle wird der Wechsel *g* - *q* noch verständlicher.

⁵⁾ Oder selbst durch Assimilation, da in SK *q* wie *k* ausgesprochen wird.

sich tatsächlich in verschiedenen Ableitungen dieser Bedeutung sowohl im klassischen Arabisch wie auch im ganzen arabischen Dialektkreis findet: in Spanien (Dozy), Nordafrika (BEAUSSIER), Ägypten (SPIRO), der arabischen Halbinsel (Dozy, LANDBERG, *Ḥaḍramout, ḡlos. Daḡīnois*, (der POZNANSKI ZDMG LXX, 462 zitiert), Palästina (SK, KAMPFFMEYER, BAUER, s.v. dunkel) und Syrien (BARTHÉLEMY, LANDBERG, '*Anaḡeh*'). Die LXX las wohl nicht *niṣṣatā*, sondern erklärte so, da sowohl Vers 17 wie 18 vom Feuer die Rede ist. In den Zusammenhang passt aber auch „finster werden“, sowohl dem einfachen Wortsinne gemäss (Vers 17 ist der Rauch erwähnt, der ja das Land verfinstern mag), wie auch als Symbol des Unglücks (vergleiche Ex. x 15 *watteḥṣaḡ ḡā'āreṣ*, Am. viii 9 *w'haḡṣaḡti lā'āreṣ*, Jermer 'āfel, 'āfelā, ṣalmāwet, 'ereṣ 'efātā).

maqṣōa', *miqṣōa'*: Ecke. GESENIUS-BUHL, GESENIUS-BROWN, KÖHLER stellten es mit südarabisch *qṣ'*, arabisch *qaṭa'a*(!) zusammen, obwohl es dann *qaḡa'a* lauten müsste; dagegen schon BROCKELMANN, *Lexicon Syriacum*, s.v. *qṣ'*. Wahrscheinlich ist zu vergleichen LANDBERG, *Ḥaḍramout* 692 *qaṣa'* couper en sens transversal, traverser, couper le cours de l'eau (ähnlich schon H. TORCZYNER ZDMG LXX, 553, vergleiche auch LANDBERG, *Glos. Daḡīnois*), und wohl auch KAMPFFMEYER *qaṣa'* den Rücken biegen (falls es nicht mit Dozy als von *qaṣ'a* Schüssel denominiert anzusehen ist).

qeṣef: Hos. x 7 *k'qeṣef 'al pnē mājim*, nach LXX, Theodotion, P^oṣitta abgeknickter Zweig¹⁾, vergleiche klassisch-arabisch *qaṣafa* Holz zerschneiden. Noch mehr entsprechen BAUER s.v. Zweig, abgeschnitten zerschneiden, SK 84, 5 *qusfāt* grüne Zweige (ursprünglich wohl auch abgeknickte Zweige).

ṣūḡ: Dies Hapax legomenon Gen. xxiv 63 bedeutet nach dem Zusammenhang sich ergehen (vergleiche *lāṣūḡ baṣṣāde* mit Vers 65 *ahōlēḡ baṣṣāde*). Ibn Ezra denominierte diese Bedeutung von *ṣūḡ* Gesträuch, NÖLDEKE, *Beiträge* ... 43 las *lāṣūḡ* (// klassisch-arabisch *ṣāḡa* wandeln), oder *lāṣuḡ*. Im Neuarabischen findet sich aber ein *ṣāḡ*, das lautgesetzlich genau hebräischen *ṣwḡ* entspricht. Es bedeutet ursprünglich scheinbar „die Arme schwingen“, so *ṣawwaḡ* SPIRO, dann die Arme schwingend einher laufen, so *ṣawwaḡ*²⁾ BARTHÉLEMY, BUSTĀNI, und danach DOZY, AJJALON, dann überhaupt einhergehen, herum-

¹⁾ Dagegen nach Targum, Aquilas, Symmachos, Vulgata „Schaum.“

²⁾ 2. Stammform anstelle der 1., wie so häufig im Neuarabischen, siehe BROCKELMANN, *Grundriss* I 609, Anmerkung, LANDBERG, *Glos. Daḡīnois* 310, 510.

streifen, so *šāḥ* BARTHÉLEMY (von einer leichtsinnigen Frau; sein Versuch, diese Bedeutung von *šuḥa* Gabelweihe zu denominieren ist nicht überzeugend; ähnlich schon LANDBERG, *Daṭīna* 800) oder eilen, so *šawwaḥ* SK.¹⁾ Diese letzteren Bedeutungen entsprechen gut Gen. xxiv 63. — Daneben entwickelt sich aus der Bedeutung „die Arme schwingen“ die allgemeinere „schwingen, werfen“, so SK *šāḥ*, LANDBERG, *Daṭīna* 800 *šawwaḥ*, ferner BAUER (mit etwas) schwingend winken *šawwaḥ bi*.

šaṭaf: strömen, abspülen. Neben dem lautgesetzlich entsprechendem *saṭaf* abspülen, findet sich *šaṭaf* in derselben Bedeutung, wohl ein Lehnwort (vergleiche BARTHÉLEMY), obwohl sehr weit verbreitet: in Syrien und Iraq (BUSTĀNI, BARTHÉLEMY), Palästina (BARTHÉLEMY, SK, BAUER s.v. spülen), Ägypten (SPIRO), vergleiche auch WEHR, AJJALON.

šoreš: Wurzel. Das neo-arabische *šurš*, *širš*, von GESENIUS-BUHL aus DALMAN, *Paläst. Diwan* zitiert, ist recht verbreitet, siehe SK, SPIRO, BUSTĀNI, BARTHÉLEMY, DOZY, WEHR, AJJALON, BAUER s.v. Wurzel.

tāqa': trompeten, klatschen, schlagen. Dieses Verbum scheint mir schallnachahmend zu sein, vergleiche BAUER s.v. schnalzen, mit seiner Zunge *taqqa' bi-lsāno*, ferner (mit *t* für *t* vor *q*, vergleiche äthiopisch *taq'a* trompeten) *taqa'* mit der Peitsche knallen, insbesondere (SK, LANDBERG, 'Anaxeh, vergleiche auch LANDBERG, *Glos. daṭīnois*) farzen;vergleiche auch *taqqa*, *taqṭaqa*.

¹⁾ Vergleiche auch LANDBERG, *Daṭīna* *šāḥ* „rollen“ (intransitiv, von den Augen).

PRÉCISIONS APPORTÉES AU VOCABULAIRE DE L'HÉBREU BIBLIQUE PAR LA GUERRE DES FILS DE LUMIÈRE CONTRE LES FILS DE TENEBRES

PAR

J. CARMIGNAC

Jérusalem

Bien que cet ouvrage ne nous soit encore accessible que par les fragments d'un seul manuscrit ¹⁾, nous pouvons commencer à profiter des enseignements qu'il nous apporte sur l'hébreu en usage aux environs de l'ère chrétienne. Et parmi ces informations, les plus précieuses pour nous sont évidemment celles qui précisent notre connaissance du vocabulaire biblique. Voilà pourquoi, négligeant les termes nouveaux qui n'ont pas de parenté dans la Bible, le lecteur de cet ouvrage s'empresse de noter tout ce qui peut lui apporter quelque lumière pour une meilleure compréhension du texte inspiré.

I. PRONONCIATION DIFFÉRENTE

Dès les premières publications des découvertes de Qumrân, on s'est aperçu que l'orthographe massorétique avait supprimé ou modifié certains détails de prononciation qui commencent maintenant nous être révélés. Comme ses collègues, le copiste de notre manuscrit multiplie les waw et les yod pour indiquer soit les sons O et OU soit le son I; comme eux, il ajoute volontiers un hé final aux désinences de la seconde personne (הגדתה „tu as annoncé” xi 5; עמכה „ton peuple” x 9; אתמה „vous” x 3; לבבכמה „votre coeur” x 3); comme certains d'entre eux, il écrit toujours כיא „car” (25 fois) et מיא „qui” x 8. 9; xiii 13-14) mais jamais ביא ou תיא.

En plus de ces particularités orthographiques, d'autres semblent révéler certaines différences de prononciation et à ce titre méritent d'être signalées.

¹⁾ Fragments publiés par SUKENIK, אוצר המגילות הגנוזות, p. 16 à 34 et 47, et complétés par M. l'Abbé MILIK, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, Qumran Cave I*, p. 135 et 136.

הוות „calamité” (i 11; xv 11; xvii 5) prend deux waw même au singulier, comme si l'un des deux avait une valeur vocalique; aurait-on prononcé howwah au lieu de hawwah? Le même phénomène se rencontre à plusieurs reprises dans les Hymnes.

קצוות „les extrémités (de la terre)” (i 8) confirme une prononciation sans doute qeçawot ou qiçwot à l'état annexe, que nous pouvions déjà entrevoir par le ketib d'Ex. xxxvii 8 et xxxix 4 קצוותו, corrigé par le qeré en קצותיו. Le Commentaire d'Habacuc (ix 14) adopte la même variante.

להב „flamme”. Bien que les Massorètes écrivent toujours להב, notre copiste n'emploie cette forme qu'une seule fois (v 10) et trois fois (v 7; v 10; vi 2) il lui préfère לוהב, comme s'il y avait eu deux termes jumeaux dérivés de cette racine, l'un en qatl et l'autre en qutl.

שלהובת (vi 3). Dans une autre forme de la même racine se répète un phénomène semblable: שלהובת se termine en qutl alors que la forme massorétique est un qatl שלִהֶבֶת (Ez. xxi 3; Job xv 30; Sir. li 3). Une influence araméenne est d'ailleurs assez vraisemblable, puisque cette langue emploie couramment שלֵהוב.

עשרה. Le copiste écrit toujours עשרה lorsqu'il s'agit du chiffre „dix”, mais pour le nom עֶשְׂרֵה „dizaine” il hésite entre la forme massorétique (iv 3. 4. 5. 17) et une forme qutl qui donne עושרות au pluriel (ii 17¹) et iv 4).

רמח „lance” est considéré au contraire par les Massorètes comme un qutl et donc vocalisé רִמַח; la prononciation de Qumrân était certainement différente car on ne trouve pas trace du son O ni au singulier רמח (v 6. 7; vi 15) ni au pluriel avec suffixe רמחיהם (ix 12).

נשי. Lorsque le mot נשיא „prince” est à l'état annexe, le copiste le prive volontiers de son alef final (en iii 15 et en iv 1 mais non en

¹) Selon l'éditeur cette ligne n'est que la ligne 16, bien qu'ailleurs sa numérotation tienne compte des lignes en blanc.

M. l'Abbé DELCOR a été induit en erreur par cette orthographe inusitée et a cru qu'il s'agissait de עושרות „les richesses”, bien que ce mot ne soit pas employé au pluriel.

Plusieurs fois dans cet article je ne pourrai accepter différentes solutions proposées par cet auteur dans sa traduction de la Guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres (*Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, avril 1955, pp. 372-399), mais je tiens souligner que l'étonnante rapidité avec laquelle il a exécuté son travail excuse certaines méprises.

1). Ainsi on obtient une forme qui est matériellement semblable à tat annexe de נָשִׁים „femmes”¹⁾.

מט. En v 1 l'éditeur signale un mem douteux suivi d'une petite tunc et d'une lettre illisible. En réalité le mem initial est pratiquement certain à cause de l'inclinaison de sa barre inférieure (comparer avec במלא à la ligne 3); la lettre finale ne peut être qu'un tet à cause de la façon dont elle se recourbe vers la droite (comparer avec שבטיהם à la ligne suivante) et entre les deux la déchirure oblique ne laisse place pour aucune autre lettre (mesurer sur les trois בטן de la ligne 13, le mem étant toujours au moins aussi large que le bet). Dans ces conditions on ne peut hésiter à lire מט et à y voir une graphie anormale de מַ „bâton de commandement, sceptre”. Et en effet il s'agit d'un objet appartenant au commandant en chef et n'appartenant qu'à lui seul. Une telle omission paraît indiquer que la voyelle et la consonne finales n'étaient à peine prononcées.

פָּרִי. Dans une citation d'Ex. xxxix 28, le copiste remplace פָּאֲרִי „urbains, mitres” par פָּרִי, qui se confond ainsi avec l'état annexe de פָּר „taureaux” ou surtout avec le mot פְּרִי „fruit”, comme l'a cru DELCOR. Aucune variante de ce genre ne se trouve ni dans le texte samaritain, ni dans l'apparat de KENNICOTT, ni dans les versions grecque, araméenne et syriaque.

יֶשֶׁר. En v 10 l'éditeur transcrit וְשֹׁפּוֹר un terme où l'on ne peut guère admettre ni le pé ni le second waw; bien plutôt il semble que l'on soit en présence d'un alef partiellement effacé et alors on croit lire יֶשֶׁר אֶל הָרָא „droit vers la tête”. L'intrusion de cet alef rendait l'adjectif-verbe יֶשֶׁר „droit” semblable au futur du verbe שָׁאַר „rester” et c'est sans doute pour cela qu'on aura essayé de gratter cet alef malencontreux.

מִזּוּ (מִמְזוּיִם v 5. 8) n'existe pas en hébreu, mais pourrait être une forme parallèle à מָסַס „fondre” (tout comme מִצָּץ „sucer”); comme le métal était alors purifié par des fontes successives, le sens aboutirait en somme à celui de „raffiner”. Peut-être n'est-ce là qu'une prononciation propre à Qumrân?

סָף (v 12) fait une réelle difficulté: les sens ordinaires de „seuil” ou de „bassin” ne conviennent pas ici, dans un passage consacré à

¹⁾ M. DELCOR, qui en outre adopte une numérotation différente pour le bas de la colonne III, s'est malheureusement laissé prendre à cette apparence trompeuse.

décrire l'équipement des soldats. On imagine qu'il s'agirait plutôt d'un carquois **אַשְׁפָּה** : il peut de fait se porter en position verticale ou oblique et l'on ne voit pas quel autre objet pourrait exister en 4 exemplaires sur chaque combattant. Mais cette hypothèse suppose à la fois l'omission de l'alef initial (comme en **אבדני** et **בדני** aux lignes 6 et 9) et la confusion phonétique entre shin et samek.

מִשְׁחָה ix 8. Dans une citation de Lévi. xxi 12, **מִשְׁחָה**, état annexe de **מִשְׁחָה** „onction”, est écrit **מִשְׁחָה**, qui de fait se rapproche davantage de **מִשְׁחָה** „oint”. Est-ce une simple variante de prononciation ou bien s'agirait-il de deux dérivés différents de la même racine? ¹⁾

II. FORMES NOUVELLES DE TERMES CONNUS

Un certain nombre de formes qui n'étaient connues que théoriquement par les lois générales de la grammaire se trouvent maintenant attestées de façon concrète.

✓ **כָּנַע** „humilier” donne bien **מִכְנֹעַת** (i 14) au participe féminin du causatif.

מָהַה „tarder”, en plus du hitpael connu jusqu'à présent, possède aussi un pael dont l'infinitif nous est attesté par xi 18.

רָדַד „allonger” existe non seulement au qatal et au hiftl, mais aussi au qolel, dont le participe **מְרֹדֵד** figure en viii 5. 14.

רוּחַ „vent” ou „esprit”. Nous n'en connaissions que le pluriel **רוּחוֹת** car dans tous les textes bibliques ce pluriel s'applique aux „vents”. Maintenant le Manuel de Discipline, les Hymnes et la Guerre nous apprennent qu'au sens d'„esprits” ce mot a aussi un pluriel à désinence masculine: **רוּחֵי** (xiii 2. 4. 10. 11; xiv 10; xv 14) et **רוּחֵי** (xii 9) mais nulle part encore **רוּחִים** ²⁾.

רָנָה „joie” peut avoir un pluriel, qui est **רִנּוֹת** (iv 4; xii 13).

¹⁾ M. DELCOR rattache ce mot à **מִשְׁחָה** „carnage”; il traduit en conséquence „Ils (= les prêtres) n'affaibliront pas, par la graisse du carnage, leur sacerdoce au lieu de: „ils ne profaneront pas l'huile de l'onction de leur sacerdoce”.

²⁾ En x 12 une énumération à 3 termes aligne l'armée des luminaires, le supposé des **רוּחוֹת** et le domaine des saints. Sans doute s'agit-il alors des „vents” (en accord avec le premier terme) plutôt que des „esprits” (en accord avec le troisième) cause de ce pluriel en **וֶת** et à cause de la place de ce mot, car les esprits (= les anges) devraient venir après les saints (= les âmes des défunts).

שָׁלַל „piller, dépouiller”, outre son infinitif שָׁלַל (Is. x 6; Ez. xxxviii 2. 13 (bis), en possède un autre plus normal en שָׁל (x 1)¹). De même nous savons par xii 10 et xix 3 qu'il fait bien שֹׁל à l'impératif. שמר „garder” peut s'employer au causatif si l'on admet la restitution d'un passage mutilé (xi 11): „השמרתה מוֹעֵד גְּבוּרַת יָדְכָּה: „tu as mis à réserve le temps de la puissance de ta main”²).

III. CONFIRMATION DE TERMES RARES

Lorsqu'un terme ne figure qu'une ou deux fois dans la Bible, son sens reste souvent imprécis et parfois même son authenticité risque d'être plus ou moins suspectée. La présence de ces termes dans un manuscrit comme la Guerre, dont nous possédons une copie assez voisine de l'original, met hors de doute leur existence et permet d'en mieux saisir la signification.

Termes qui ne figurent qu'une seule fois dans la Bible

רוח (הדיחו[תנו] xiv 9) est employé trois fois dans la Bible au sens de „laver” et une fois seulement au sens d’„expulser” (Jér. li 34). La finale de ce mot est en partie mutilée, mais le radical en est certain et la restitution de תנו est imposée par le contexte, d'ailleurs une partie du taw est encore visible: „(tu) ne (nous) as pas rejetés de ton alliance”³). Les Hymnes (iv 8) connaissent aussi cette acception.

זִיק (vi 3) confirme Prov. xxvi 18. Le sens de ce mot était peut-être plus précis que celui de שֶׁלַח et il désignerait ainsi le „javelot” et non pas le „trait” en général. En gros ces deux termes se distingueraient l'un de l'autre à peu près comme en latin telum (= שֶׁלַח = trait) et lum (= זִיק = javelot). Voir aussi les Hymnes i 12.

חבל (xiii 12) confirme Mich. ii 10 au sens de „perdition”. Ce terme

¹) Voir JOÜON, *Grammaire de l'Hébreu Biblique*, n° 82 k.

²) M. DELCOR propose השמרתה ב[ועד „tu détruiras à cause de”. Mais דתה demande 7 millimètres (mesurer sur הגדתה de la ligne 5) et ב précédé d'un interstice en demande 3 (mesurer sur בכתיים ou sur בחוב dans cette même ligne 11), alors que la lacune en comprend 11. Au contraire מו précédé d'un interstice en exige 4 (mesurer sur מואב à la ligne 6).

³) M. DELCOR a préféré l'autre sens de רוח et il a restitué דם „le sang:” „ils ne laveront pas (le sang) de ton alliance”; mais cette hypothèse est contredite par le manuscrit où l'on voit nettement que le waw est suivi d'une autre lettre appartenant au même mot.

est d'ailleurs connu en araméen (Dan. iii 25) et on le retrouve dans le Document de Damas (ii 6) et dans le Manuel de Discipline (iv 12).

חדל (iv 3) rejoint matériellement Is. xxxviii 11 mais s'en distingue pour le sens, car l'expression d'Isaïe יושבי חָדָל désignerait plutôt le lieu „les habitants du . . .” tandis que dans la Guerre il s'agit de l'inscription choisie pour l'étendard des cinquantaines: „Disparition de la présence des impies”. Même si l'on pense qu'en Isaïe ce terme ne représente pas l'original, le témoignage de la Guerre nous montre que les copistes ont introduit et maintenu là un terme bel et bien existant¹.

חרת (xii 3, ainsi que Hymnes i 24; ii 19 et Manuel de Discipline x 6. 8. 11) n'était connu que par le participe חָרוּת „gravé” d'Ex xxxii 16.

מראה (v 5. 11) n'existait au sens de „miroir” qu'en Ex xxxviii 17. Pour ne laisser aucun doute, notre auteur lui donne chaque fois pour complément פנים „un miroir de visage” et l'emploie dans des expressions significatives: „poli comme un miroir”, „luisant comme un miroir”.

מסורה ou מסורת (iii 3. 13) rappelle מִסְרָה d'Ez. xx 37, mais son sens est difficile à préciser. En iii 3 la troisième catégorie de trompette qui suit celles de „l'appel de la communauté” et de „l'appel des chefs” et qui précède celles des „hommes en renom”, s'appelle „les trompettes des מסורות” et elles portent comme inscription „Règlement de Dieu”. Cette expression ne reviendra pas dans le reste de l'ouvrage mais on y reparlera à plusieurs reprises des „vieillards du règlement” (xiii 1), des „cavaliers du règlement” (vi 14) ou surtout des „hommes du règlement” (vi 11; vii 1; xv 4 et peut-être xviii 6), qui feront figure de commissaires à l'observation des prescriptions légales. Peut-être est-ce d'eux qu'il s'agit ici, comme le suggère la teneur de l'inscription où est mentionné le mot סרך „règlement”. En ce cas מסורה apparaîtrait presque comme un synonyme de סרך et revêtirait déjà le sens de „tradition” qu'il aura dans la langue des rabbins et c.

¹ En Isaïe l'archétype dont découlent tous nos témoins actuels paraît bien avoir porté חדל, puisque le grand manuscrit de Qumrân et les Massorètes s'accordent sur cette forme; nous ne pouvons malheureusement utiliser la Septante, puisqu'elle a été victime d'un saut visuel (de עור à דור) mais les recensions postérieures traduisent par ἐξέλιπον (= אחדל) et donc se rapprochent des Massorètes. Pechitto paraît avoir lu un dérivé de la racine חרף „creuser” ou „avoir honte” et le Targum traduit comme s'il lisait תכל „la terre”. Les 8 manuscrits massorétiques qui portent חלד ne doivent donc pas être considérés comme des reflets de l'archétype mais comme des corrections intentionnelles effectuées sous l'influence du Ps. xlix 2.

rompettes seraient celles de „l'appel des (hommes des) traditions”. En iii 13 la liste des formules à inscrire sur les étendards est annoncée par le titre suivant: „Règlement (סרך) des étendards de toute la communauté למסורותם”. Ce nouveau rapprochement entre סרך et מסור incite à comprendre: „pour (être conformes à) leurs traditions, aux prescriptions traditionnelles qui les concernent”. Dans les deux cas, M. DELCOR, s'appuyant sur le sens du verbe מסר en Nombr. xxxi (1), traduit par „mobilisation”; mais ce texte n'est pas certain (la septante lit ספר) et surtout le sens obtenu s'harmonise mal à notre contexte, où la „mobilisation” est un curieux intermédiaire entre les chefs et les notables. En Ezéchiel ce sens de „tradition” paraît également convenir: „je vous introduirai dans la tradition de l'Alliance”. On ne doit donc plus suspecter ce mot uniquement parce qu'il était inconnu en hébreu.

מרדך (iii 2. 9; vii 13; ix 6) désigne la „poursuite” de l'ennemi en léroute et convient fort bien à Is. xiv 6: „poursuite sans relâche”. Toutefois la vocalisation massorétique מרדך aurait normalement donné מורדך selon l'orthographe de Qumrân. La prononciation effective était-elle différente? מרדוך de ix 6 ferait plutôt penser à mardof ou mirdof.

משפ. En xvii 2 une lacune de 15 millimètres est précédée de משפ et l'un trait vertical qui peut être le début de dalet, hé, waw, zaïn, het, od, resh ou taw. Comme le contexte indique assez clairement que le reste de la lacune contenait les mots [נרב ואבין]הוא, „Nadab et Abihou, les fils d'Aaron” et que ces 7 lettres avec les 2 interstices qui séparent les mots exigent environ 14 millimètres, on est amené à conclure que le terme commençant par משפ ne devait guère compter que 4 lettres et qu'il s'agissait probablement de מִשְׁפָּח „effusion de sang, mort violente”. Ce terme a évidemment été choisi à cause de son assonance avec מִשְׁפָּט „jugement” qui se trouve quelques mots plus loin. Précisément Is. v 7 réalise le même jeu de mot entre מִשְׁפָּט et מִשְׁפָּח (2).

נהיה (xvii 5) confirme opportunément נהיה „lamentation” de Mich. ii 4, suspecté par certains critiques.

נצץ ou נצץ En xii 5 on lit שמים „les cieux” puis un terme mutilé

¹) Dans le Document de Damas (iii 3 et xix 10) et dans le Manuel de Discipline x 4) ce verbe paraît signifier „transmettre”.

²) M. DELCOR restitue ici משפט „jugement”, mais la lettre qui suit le pé ne peut pas être un tet.

par une lacune, mais dont la première lettre ne peut être que nour (ou à la rigueur pé) et dont les deux suivantes sont וצ ou יצ (la lecture דם ou רם avec mem final paraît également possible à première vue mais à la réflexion elle est exclue par la forme de l'angle inférieur). Dans ces conditions on restitue avec vraisemblance un participe comme נוצים ou נוצים. Cette dernière forme se trouve effectivement en Ez. i 7 où elle provient soit du verbe נוצ (ZORELL) soit du verbe נצץ (GESENIUS-BUHL, KOEHLER-BAUMGARTNER). Le sens „étincelants”, très net en Ezéchiel, convient ici à merveille pour qualifier les cieux. Le verbe נוצ n'est pas connu par ailleurs et נצץ l'est seulement au causatif, où il signifie „fleurir”.

סדר. Le nom סדר „arrangement” n'est représenté dans la littérature biblique que par Job x 22 et le verbe סָדַר „disposer, mettre en ordre” ne l'est que par Sir. x 1 et l 14; par contre tous deux sont usuels dans la Guerre (15 fois le nom, 3 fois le verbe) comme dans les autres écrits de Qumrân. Cette racine est d'un emploi fréquent en araméen.

צורה (v 5. 8. 14; vii 11) confirme Ez. xliii 11 et paraît s'accommoder aussi du sens de „forme”, qui est normal en araméen¹).

קשי (xiv 7) s'applique à la „dureté” du coeur tout comme קָשִׁי d Deut. ix 27 à l'indocilité du peuple.

רוּה vocalisé רְוָה, existe en Gen. xxxii 17, comme en araméen, pour désigner un „intervalle”, un „espace libre” (et cette vocalisation serait peut-être aussi indiquée en Job xli 8, selon PERLES, *Analekten zur Textkritik des Alten Testaments*, p. 65). Notre auteur emploie ce terme en vii 6 (et sans doute aussi en v 17 où l'éditeur n'ose identifier le resh, pourtant encore assez lisible) dans un sens absolument identique: „il y aura un espace entre tous leurs camps, pour le lieu de la main, d'environ 2.000 coudées”²).

רו (iii 9; xiv 9. 14; xvi 11. 16; xvii 9) est un terme araméen, bien attesté dans Daniel et dans toute la littérature de Qumrân, qui apparaît

¹ Au Ps. xlix 15 le terme incertain צִירִים (ketib) ou צוֹרִים (qeré) est parfois interprété comme une altération de צוֹרָתָם; mais on ne peut s'appuyer sur un exemple aussi suspect.

² M. DELCOR vocalise רוּה et supprime les 2.000 coudées; il peut ainsi traduire: „l'Esprit sera parmi tous leurs camps, au lieu de la puissance”. Il explique même, pp. 378-379 et 399, qu'il s'agirait d'un véritable sanctuaire. En fait Is. lviii et le Manuel de Discipline vii 13 indiquent clairement quel euphémisme constitue l'emploi du mot „main” et la référence manifeste à Deut. xxiii 13-15 montre que l'auteur pense à tout autre chose qu'à un sanctuaire.

hébreu dans Sir. viii 18. On peut le traduire par „secret”, „mystère” et peut-être même par „piège” (iii 9; xiv 9; xvi 11).

רשה (xii 4) ne se trouve que dans Sir. iii 22. Le sens araméen „avoir autorité, puissance” convient d'autant mieux que ce verbe a pour complément יד „la main” qui est, ici, une métaphore pour désigner la puissance.

תשבוה (iv 8) dérive, comme תשבחות de Sir. li 12 (qu'il faudrait peut-être vocaliser תשבחות), de la racine araméenne שבה „louer, glorifier”.

Termes qui ne figurent que deux fois dans la Bible

בוע (הבענה xix 7) confirme Sir. xiv 4 et xvi 2. Ce terme araméen est substitué ici à צרחנה de xii 15 et il doit en reproduire approximativement le sens: „clamez”.

דמיון (vi 13) ne se trouve qu'au Ps. xvii 12 et en Sir. iii 24 où il prend au pluriel la désinence ות et non pas ים comme ici. Si l'on interprète ce mot d'après l'araméen (= imagination) on obtient un sens excellent: les chevaux de combat seront accoutumés „à entendre les bruits et à tous les spectacles d'imaginations (= imaginables)”¹.

חרט (xii 3) se trouve en Ex. xxxii 4 au sens de „burin” et en Is. viii 1 celui de „stylet”. Ici comme en Isaïe, le stylet serait peut-être une expression imagée pour désigner l'écriture: „tu les as gravés avec le stylet de vie (ou: dans le livre de vie)”. Manifestement l'auteur choisit ce terme par assonance avec חרת „graver”.

משטמה (xiii 4. 11) signifie „hostilité” comme en Os. ix 7. 8 et dans le Document de Damas (xvi 5) ou le Manuel de Discipline (iii 23)².

צרח (xii 15) signifie „clamer” comme en Is. xlii 13 et en Soph. i 14. Dans le passage parallèle de xix 7 l'auteur ou un copiste lui substituèrent בוע, plus fréquent en araméen; serait-ce parce que ce terme serait plus ou moins tombé en désuétude? Pourtant on le retrouve dans les Hymnes (iii 33).

¹ M. DELCOR traduit „et tous d'aspect semblables”, mais alors on devrait supprimer la préposition ל, ajouter le suffixe ם après לכול et l'on aurait sans doute מראי דמיוני מראים plutôt que מראי דמונים.

² On se demande pourquoi M. DELCOR en a fait un nom propre: „l'ange Mastéma”, „le dessein de Mastéma”. Dans ces deux cas, comme dans le Document de Damas xvi 5 et dans le Manuel de Discipline iii 23, ce terme est employé comme qualificatif de Bélial: c'est un „ange d'hostilité”; il est maudit „dans (son) dessein d'hostilité”, en parallélisme avec „dans le service de son iniquité” (traduction de M. DELCOR).

Sur les 24 termes rares ainsi rencontrés dans la Guerre, on notera sans étonnement que 9 d'entre eux trahissent une influence araméenne (בוע; דמיון; חבל; רשע; רז; צורה; סדר; מסורה; חבל) et que 6 fois ils confirment le vocabulaire du Siracide (בוע; דמיון; חבל; רשע; רז; סדר). Par contre dans une quinzaine de cas on a l'impression de se trouver devant d'authentiques formes hébraïques qui ne caractérisent pas nécessairement une étape plus récente de la langue. Certaines, comme משפח; נהיה; נוי; נציץ; צרה, étaient peut-être d'un usage assez rare et surtout poétique; mais d'autres, comme זיק; חרט; חרת; מרדף; נוח, ont pu être assez fréquemment employées bien que, par hasard, elles n'aient pas eu l'occasion de figurer souvent dans les textes bibliques.

IV. PRÉCISIONS SUR LE SENS DE TERMES CONNUS

La littérature de Qumrân nous présente certains termes dans un sens un peu différent de celui que nous connaissions, ainsi גורל (= parti), מועד (= temps), קץ (= époque), תכון (= norme), et l'auteur de la Guerre nous indique suffisamment qu'il est issu du même milieu. Mais en outre quelques précisions de sens ne se trouvent que dans cet ouvrage.

בטן (v 13) Dans un texte fort difficile on nous dit littéralement: „la בטן (aura) 4 pouces (?) et (il y aura) 4 palmes jusqu'à la בטן et la בטן jambée de part et d'autre (aura) 5 palmes”. Quels que soient les détails de traduction, il semble que בטן n'ait pas comme à l'ordinaire le sens de „ventre” mais que ce mot désigne ici un vêtement destiné à protéger le ventre, donc une sorte de cuissard, qui descendait jusqu'aux environs des genoux, puisque ses jambes auront 5 palmes (= 43 centimètres 75).

בנינים Ce mot, qui se présente sous les formes בנינים (4 fois), הבנים (4 fois) ou הבנינים (5 fois), plus le cas de vii 17 où l'article est douteux, doit sans doute se vocaliser בְּנִינִים, d'après 1 Sam. xvii 4. 23.

Voici les différents contextes où apparaissent ces bēnayim:

i 14 „Il y aura les troupes des bēnayim pour fondre le cœur”.

iii 1 „Les trompettes de l'appel sonneront à l'ouverture des portes de la guerre pour la sortie des hommes des bēnayim”.

iii 7 „Sur les trompettes de l'appel des hommes des bēnayim, à l'ouverture des portes de la guerre pour la sortie vers le rang de l'ennemi, on écrira”.

vi 1 „Après eux sortiront trois corps de bēnayim et ils se tiendront entre les rangs”. Dans le contexte ils sont armés de javelots.

vi 4 „Après eux sortiront deux corps de bēnayim et ils se tiendront entre les deux rangs”. Dans le contexte les uns sont armés d’une lance et d’un bouclier, les autres d’un bouclier et d’un coutelas.

vi 9 „Deux cents cavaliers sortiront avec un millier, (c’est-à-dire) un rang, d’hommes de bēnayim”.

vi 11-12 „Tous les chars sortiront au combat avec les hommes des bēnayim”.

vii 15-16 „(On ouvrira les portes de la guerre) ¹⁾ sur 50 boucliers et 50 hommes de bēnayim sortiront de la première porte”.

vii 17. Malgré le voisinage de deux lacunes, on devine avec une certaine vraisemblance que des bēnayim sortiront „des portes” et se tiendront „entre les deux rangs”.

viii 3-4 „Les prêtres sonneront dans les trompettes de l’appel et trois corps de bēnayim sortiront des portes; ils se tiendront entre les rangs et à côté d’eux (seront) les hommes des chars”.

ix 3-4 „Les prêtres sonneront dans les trompettes de l’appel et tous les hommes des bēnayim sortiront vers eux du milieu des rangs du front; six corps se tiendront (là), plus le corps attaquant, en tout sept rangs, (soit) 28.000 hommes de guerre et 6.000 (hommes) montés”.

xvi 4 „On ouvrira les portes . . . , les hommes des bēnayim sortiront et les chefs se tiendront entre les rangs”.

xvi 11 „Les tués des bēnayim commenceront à tomber”. Il s’agit, évidemment, des ennemis tués par les bēnayim, car l’auteur n’envisage même pas qu’un Fils de Lumière puisse succomber.

xvii 12-13. Bien qu’une lacune ait malheureusement fait disparaître le mot **בִּינִים** (ה) (בִּינִים), le contexte permet de le rétablir presque à coup sûr: „Quand les hommes (des bēnayim) atteindront (à proximité du rang des Kittim) à portée de jet” . . . „et les hommes des bēnayim jetteront leur main sur l’armée des Kittim”.

Après avoir passé en revue tous ces textes, on en dégage sans peine diverses conclusions qui permettront de préciser le sens du mot **בִּינִים**.

1°) Les hommes des bēnayim sont formellement distincts des cavaliers (vi 9; ix 3) et des charriers (vi 11-12).

2°) Ils ne sont pas caractérisés par un équipement déterminé, puisqu’ils combattent les uns avec le javelot (vi 1), les autres avec la lance ou le coutelas (vi 4).

¹⁾ Cette lacune peut être comblée avec une bonne probabilité grâce aux passages parallèles de iii 7 et xvi 4.

3°) Ils ne forment pas un „corps” (דגל) spécial, puisqu'on a tantôt 3 corps de bēnayim (vi 1), tantôt 2 (vi 4), tantôt 1 (vi 9, car le „rang” est l'équivalent du „corps” selon ix 4), à nouveau 3 (viii 3-4) et enfin 7 (ix 3-4).

4°) Ils ne se trouvent pas dans le camp, où jamais l'on ne parle d'eux, mais ils commencent à recevoir ce nom dès qu'ils sortent au combat: cette idée de „sortie” est exprimée 10 ou 11 fois.

5°) Ils sont aussi nombreux que les fantassins de l'armée, puisqu'ils sont 28.000 (ix 3-4), flanqués de 6.000 hommes montés, alors que nous savons par vi 7-11 que l'armée comprend en tout 4.600 cavaliers et 1.400 charriers encadrant 4 corps de 7.000 fantassins ¹⁾.

Si l'on tient compte également de l'étymologie, car בנייִם est le duel de בָּיִן „entre”, on en conclut en définitive que les hommes des bēnayim sont tous les combattants non-montés qui s'avancent entre les deux camps, comme c'est bien précisé en vi 4, pour participer à la bataille.

Mais il est plus difficile de trouver en français un terme équivalent: „fantassins” escamote le sens véritable ²⁾; on a proposé de divers côtés: „hommes d'avant-postes” ³⁾, „troupes de pénétration” ⁴⁾, „voltigeurs” ⁵⁾, mais ces termes, choisis avant qu'on ne connaisse l'ensemble du texte, ont tous plus ou moins l'inconvénient de laisser croire qu'ils ne s'appliquent qu'à une catégorie spéciale de soldats. La formule de M. DELCOR „les hommes d'entre les lignes” est plus heureuse. Peut-être pourrait-on proposer aussi „les hommes de la mêlée” ou, plus brièvement, „les combattants”, afin de mieux souligner que tous les soldats, sauf les cavaliers et les charriers, deviennent des hommes des

¹⁾ L'auteur a commis en vi 10 une curieuse faute de calcul. Il semble alors répartir son armée en 4 corps de 7.000 fantassins et il fait accompagner chaque millier par 200 cavaliers et 50 charriers. Pour les charriers, son opération est exacte: $50 \times 7 \times 4$ donne bien 1.400. Pour les cavaliers au contraire $200 \times 7 \times 4$ devrait donner 5.600 et non pas 4.600; on a l'impression qu'en multipliant 1.400 par 4 l'auteur a oublié une retenue. C'est cette étourderie qui empêche que le rapport des hommes montés (qui devraient être 7.000) et des hommes de pied (qui sont 28.000) ne soit toujours dans la proportion d'un à quatre. Cette faute n'est pas imputable à un copiste; elle remonte bien à l'auteur, car c'est à cause d'elle qu'il imagine de fixer le contingent de chaque tribu à 500 hommes montés (vi 11).

²⁾ Aussi je ne maintiens pas la traduction que j'avais donnée dans la *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, juillet 1955, p. 739.

³⁾ R. P. TOURNAY „Les Anciens Manuscrits Hébreux récemment Découverts”, *Revue Biblique*, 1949, p. 212.

⁴⁾ M. DUPONT-SOMMER, *Aperçus Préliminaires sur les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte*, p. 100.

⁵⁾ M. MICHAUD, „Une Apocalypse Nouvelle”, *Positions Luthériennes*, avril 1955.

bênayim quand ils sortent du camp pour en venir aux mains avec l'ennemi.

Et ainsi les textes de 1 Sam. xvii 4. 23 prennent un sens limpide: Goliath est un homme de bênayim tout simplement parce qu'il sort (v. 4) ou monte (v. 23) du camp et vient entre les lignes pour y engager le combat.

כִּידָן. Ce terme est généralement traduit par „javelot” et les dictionnaires le définissent ainsi: „probabiliter breve jaculum, hasta” (ZORELL), „eine Art Spiess, etwa Wurfspiess” (GESENIUS-BUHL), „Wurfspeer, dart” (KOEHLER-BAUMGARTNER). Or la Guerre nous en donne une description précise qui ne laisse place à aucun doute.

Les combattants auront en main „une pique et un kîdan” (v 7); ailleurs on distingue ceux qui portent „la lance et le bouclier” et ceux qui portent „le bouclier et le kîdan” (vi 5). „Les kîdan (seront en fer de choix purifié au creuset¹⁾ et lissé comme un miroir” (v 11). „Longueur du kîdan: une coudée et demie, et sa largeur: quatre doigts”²⁾ (v 12-13). „La poignée du kîdan (sera en) corne de choix, façonnée habilement, avec une décoration multicolore³⁾ en or, en argent et (en) pierres précieuses” (v 14).

Cette description ne peut guère s'appliquer au javelot: une largeur de 8 cm 75 est inconcevable pour une arme qui doit être effilée. Et que dire des poignées en corne, décorées d'or, d'argent et de pierres précieuses? Si naïf qu'on le suppose, notre auteur se garderait bien de bombarder l'ennemi avec de telles oeuvres d'art. Il réserve ce luxe aux armes personnelles du combattant: le bouclier (v 5), l'empoigne de la pique (v 7-9), le fourreau (v 10 et 12).

Au contraire le kîdan est, comme la lance ou la pique, une arme pour le combat corps à corps (v 7), d'où la nécessité de se protéger par le bouclier (vi 5); il possède une poignée comme l'épée (v 14); sa lame est assez large (v 13) et on la veut bien tranchante (v 11). Nul doute qu'il s'agisse d'une épée courte et robuste conçue pour frapper d'estoc et de taille. En attendant que les spécialistes nous précisent le nom exact de cette arme, on peut lui garder le nom très vague de

¹⁾ M. DELCOR omet בְּרוֹז „fer” et croit reconnaître le mot בְּכוֹר „aîné” au lieu de כֹּר + בְּ „dans le creuset”; cela l'engage à traduire: „les javelots seront purs de la pureté d'un nouveau-né”.

²⁾ C'est-à-dire environ 67 cm $\frac{1}{2}$ de long et 8 cm 75 de large.

³⁾ La traduction de ces deux mots n'est qu'approximative, mais cela n'a pas d'importance pour l'ensemble du raisonnement.

„coutelas”, car elle est plus longue que le simple poignard, mais moins que la véritable épée. D'ailleurs nous pouvons nous faire une idée assez juste du kîdan grâce à un bas relief de Palmyre, actuellement au Musée du Louvre, que reproduisent soit M. SEYRIG (*Syria* 1949, numéro 1, planche 2), soit M. l'Abbé STARCKY (*Palmyre*, p. 89). L'arme que portent les trois divinités répond trait pour trait à la description de notre auteur: poignée sculptée, lame qui a la même largeur que les 4 doigts de la main, longueur qui dépasse un peu le tiers de la taille du personnage (donc sans doute aux environs de 65 cm); fourreau dirigé vers la tête et attaché des deux côtés (comme en v 10 et 12). Trois autres kîdan, plus ou moins mutilés mais encore reconnaissables, figurent dans le bas relief du „Combat contre l'Anguipède” (voir M. SEYRIG, *Syria* 1934, p. 165 à 173 et planches XXII et XXIV, ou bien *Antiquités Syriennes*, 2^e série pages 20 à 27 et planches XXII et XXIV) et un quatrième, avec poignée sculptée en tête de cheval, se remarque dans le bas-relief de „Iarhibôl, Aglibôl et une Déesse” (voir M. SEYRIG, *Syria* 1934, p. 178 à 181, ou bien *Antiquités Syriennes*, 2^e série, p. 31 à 34).

Si maintenant l'on se reporte aux principaux textes bibliques où figure le kîdan ¹⁾, on s'aperçoit que cette interprétation nouvelle leur convient au moins aussi bien que l'ancienne. Si Josué brandit une arme pendant tout le massacre des habitants de 'Ay, il est normal que ce soit la courte et robuste épée utilisée pour ce genre de besogne et non pas le javelot, sans rapport avec les circonstances (Jos. viii 18.26; Sir. xlvii 2) ²⁾. Dans l'équipement de Goliath (1 Sam. xvii 6 et 45), il ne saurait être question d'une arme de jet comme le javelot, l'ensemble du récit le prouve suffisamment, mais bien d'une arme de main, comme la lance ou l'épée; certes le géant ne pouvait se servir des trois armes à la fois, mais il voulait terrifier le plus possible et changer d'arme selon les diverses péripéties du combat; s'il porte ce kîdan „entre les épaules” (1 Sam. xvii 6) et non pas à la ceinture, il ne fait que se conformer à un usage antique: dans l'*Iliade* xi 29

¹⁾ Les Massorètes écrivent toujours כִּידָן, mais si ce son O avait existé dans la dernière syllabe le scribe de Qumrân n'aurait pas manqué de l'indiquer par le waw habituel. Une fois de plus constatons que la prononciation de l'hébreu a dû varier au cours des âges.

²⁾ Le Musée de Damas possède une épée, trouvée à Ras-Shamra, qui ressemble fort à un kîdan et qui porte le cartouche du Pharaon Mineptah; cette arme pourrait donc être à peu près contemporaine de Josué (voir M. SCHAEFFER, *Annales Archéologiques de Syrie*, 1953, p. 141-142).

gamemnon jette son épée „autour de ses épaules” ¹⁾ et selon Arrien (*Tactique* IV, 8) „une longue et large épée est suspendue aux épaules” des cavaliers romains. Dans le livre de Job (xli 21) on imagine en général que Léviatan se rit du sifflement du javelot **לְרֵעַשׁ כִּידוֹן**. Mais **רֵעַ** indique un bruit considérable, un véritable fracas, et non pas un simple sifflement. Puis, comment faire gloire à un monstre tel que Léviatan de mépriser ce sifflement? Le poète ne ferait-il pas allusion plutôt à des scènes de chasse? Les rabatteurs s'efforcent d'effrayer l'animal par le bruit de leurs armes et de le guider vers un piège, mais souvent sans résultat.

Comme on le voit, les textes bibliques sont favorables au sens approximatif de „coutelas” et la Guerre l'impose nettement.

סַגֵּר (v 7. 9) est donné comme le nom technique de la poignée de la pique. Pour se rapprocher du sens de la racine **סַגַּר** „enfermer”, on pourrait peut-être traduire par „empoigne”, pour bien souligner qu'il s'agit de la partie de l'arme „enfermée”, serrée dans la main. L'auteur nous dit d'abord que „la longueur de la pique (sera de) 7 coudées, sans compter l'empoigne (**הַסַּגֵּר**) et la flamme (= la pointe) d'une demi-coudée” (v 7). Puis il précise que „dans l'empoigne (il y aura) trois anneaux (ou: bracelets)” (v 7) et que „l'empoigne (sera) ciselée entre les anneaux à la façon d'une colonne” (v 9-10): sans doute l'un de ces anneaux jouait-il le rôle de la garde et les deux autres servaient de contrepoids. En tout cas, ceci éclaire fort à propos le Ps. xxxv 3: Saisis la rondache et le bouclier . . . Tire la lance et la pique”. Prenant la partie pour le tout, le psalmiste utilise **סַגֵּר** „l'empoigne” pour désigner en réalité la pique tout entière. Le parallélisme est parfait: dans le premier vers les armes défensives sont tour à tour le petit bouclier (**מִגָּן**) des cavaliers et le grand bouclier (**צִנְהָה**) des fantassins; dans le second vers les armes offensives sont tour à tour la lance (**חֲנִית**) des cavaliers et la pique (**סַגֵּר**) des fantassins ²⁾. Toutefois la vocalisation massorétique **סָגֵר** ne paraît pas répondre à la prononciation de Qumrân qui serait plutôt **סָגֵר** ou **סָגֵר**.

¹⁾ Cité par E. BEURLIER dans l'article „Gladius” du *Dictionnaire des Antiquités Grecques et Romaines* de DAREMBERG et SAGLIO.

²⁾ L'auteur de la Guerre ne paraît pas distinguer aussi nettement les armes de l'infanterie et de la cavalerie: chez lui **מִגָּן** vaut pour toutes les sortes de boucliers et la pique a presque complètement supplanté la lance (sauf en vi 5); mais le psalmiste montre clairement que pour lui chaque terme a conservé sa valeur propre.

שבולת (v 9. 10. 11) Ces textes difficiles mentionnent un objet appelé שבולת („flot” ou „épi” en hébreu biblique) dont la surface est plaquée d’or (lignes 11-12), qui est tenu par deux attaches ¹⁾ (ligne 12), qui doit être tourné vers la tête (lignes 10-11, en lisant רש(א)ר et qui a un certain rapport avec la flamme (c’est-à-dire la pointe de la pique ou plutôt la lame du kidan) (ligne 10). Tous ces renseignements font penser au fourreau. Cette identification serait même certaine si l’on pouvait avec assurance vocaliser בתוך הלהב en בתוך הלהב et comprendre: „à l’intérieur (il y a) la lame”; mais il faut reconnaître que la vocalisation בתוך הלהב paraît plus naturelle et alors on se retrouve en plein mystère: que peut-il bien y avoir „au milieu de la lame”? Si cette interprétation, d’ailleurs assez hypothétique, correspondait à la réalité, le mot שבולת aurait alors comme 3^e signification celle de „fourreau”. Peut-être lui fut-elle donnée à cause d’une décoration en rainures qui pouvait donner l’illusion d’un épi ²⁾). D’ailleurs le vocable hébraïque qui désigne le fourreau, תַּעַר, semble être tombé assez vite en désuétude puisqu’en 1 Chron. xxi 27 on doit recourir à נֶזֶן (d’origine persane) et que l’Evangile de s. Matthieu (xxvi 52) au lieu d’employer un terme précis (suppléé de fait par s. Jean xviii 11: εἰς τὴν θήκαην) se sert d’une tournure très vague: εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτῆς ³⁾).

V. TERMES NOUVEAUX DÉRIVÉS DE RACINES CONNUES

Nous ne pouvions évidemment pas prétendre connaître tous les vocables qui ont existé de fait dans la langue hébraïque, car les racines sémitiques sont capables de former bien des dérivés. La Guerre nous en apporte une nouvelle preuve en nous révélant un certain nombre de termes qui ne sont pas bibliques mais qui nous aident à mieux deviner la richesse de sens des racines auxquelles ils se rattachent.

¹⁾ La transcription de l’éditeur par חוברת n’est pas au-dessus de tout soupçon et l’on se demande s’il ne faudrait pas lire plutôt חוברת.

²⁾ Dans l’article „Vagina” de A. REINACH, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités Grecques et Romaines* de DAREMBERG et SAGLIO, la figure 7. 244 montre un fourreau sur lequel est précisément gravé un épi.

³⁾ En tout ce raisonnement je n’ai pas tenu compte de la ligne 9, car je crois que שבולת n’y figure que par suite d’un saut visuel qui fit croire à un copiste qu’il se trouvait déjà à la ligne suivante; il reprit ensuite son vrai texte avec הסגר mais négligea d’exponctuer le terme fautif. Même si l’on considérait ce mot comme authentique, son interprétation générale n’en serait pas modifiée.

בלה (x 14) provient de בָּלַל „mélanger, confondre” tout comme בָּזָה, זָפַן, גָּדָה proviennent de בָּזָן ou נָדַד et donc on est invité à supposer une vocalisation telle que בָּלָה. Le sens de „mélange, confusion” est imposé par le contexte puisqu'il s'agit de „la confusion des langues” dans un passage où l'on résume les principaux faits de la Genèse ¹).

ברקה ou ברקת (vi 2) doit être une forme parallèle à בָּרַק „foudre, éclair”. On n'est même pas autorisé, semble-t-il, à y suspecter quelque nuance abstraite, comme par exemple „fulmination”, puisque les deux descriptions symétriques commencent par des termes très concrets: זִי „javelots”, שְׁלֵהוֹבַת „flamme”. L'auteur a pu choisir ce terme par souci de solennité, car il manifeste parfois un goût prononcé pour les formes emphatiques.

דֶּלֶק (xvii 1) La racine דֶּלֶק signifie „brûler” au sens propre ou au sens métaphorique (de rage) et nous n'en connaissons que le verbe דָּלַק et le substantif דִּלְקָת. Peut-être avons-nous ici un infinitif qittel pris comme nom (au qatal on aurait sans doute écrit דְּלוֹק), peut-être est-ce une véritable forme nominale signifiant „l'incendie”, la mise à feu et à sang”, „le sac d'une ville”. Le choix de ce terme paraît avoir été influencé par un désir d'assonance car il était sans doute suivi de עֲמַלֶּק ²) et donc cela peut nous inciter à supposer une vocalisation telle que דָּלַק, דֶּלֶק ou au moins דָּלֶק.

הוֹדוֹת (iv 14; xv 5; se trouve aussi dans les Hymnes xi 4) signifie certainement „louanges” et donc ne doit pas être le pluriel de הוֹד „vigueur, honneur”. Bien plutôt on y verra la preuve de l'existence d'un nom הוֹדָה parallèle à תוֹדָה.

הַטָּל (viii 15; xvi 6; xvii 12) est considéré par M. FÉVRIER ³) comme une transcription du grec τέλος au sens de „corps de troupe” et

¹) M. DELCOR traduit curieusement „(sans)? langue” comme s'il assimilait בָּלַל à בָּלִי ou à בָּלִיתִי.

²) Les bribes du texte conservé suffisent à nous indiquer qu'il s'agit ici d'un cas de punition et de substitution provoqué par une violation de la loi du hêrêm lors d'une guerre. Le seul cas semblable que rapporte la Bible et celui de Saül parquant le roi des Amalécites et s'attirant pour cela la réprobation de Dieu (1 Sam. xv 1-35). Comme on distingue encore avant la lacune un vestige qui paraît provenir d'un aîn, la restitution de עֲמַלֶּק paraît admissible.

³) „La Tactique Hellénistique dans un Texte d'Ayin Fashkha”, *Semitica*, 1950, p. 54 et 56.

M. DELCOR adopte cette solution. Si ce sens est à la rigueur acceptable en viii 15, il ne l'est plus du tout en xvi 6 et xvii 12, où M. DELCOR est obligé de traduire **הטל כדרי** par „selon l'abondance de la troupe”, bien que cela n'ait guère de rapport avec le contexte. Au lieu de ce recours au grec, ne vaut-il pas mieux commencer par tenter d'expliquer ce terme d'après l'hébreu, comme l'ont fait SUKENIK ¹⁾ et le R. P. Tournay ²⁾? Le verbe **טול** est employé en vi 4 sous la forme **יטילו** pour dire „ils jetteront, ils lanceront, ils tireront” ³⁾ et ce verbe donne précisément **הטל** à l'infinitif absolu. Si l'on admet que cet infinitif ait

été employé comme nom on obtient un sens excellent dans les trois passages en question: en viii 15 l'auteur nous dit que „dès le premier jet” ⁴⁾ on poussera le cri de guerre (comme en xvi 6-9 et xvii 12-14) en xvi 6 et xvii 12 il précise qu'il faudra brandir ses armes quand on arrivera „près du rang des Kittim, à portée de jet”.

זרק (vi 2(bis). 3. 16; viii 11) En hébreu biblique cette racine signifie „asperger”. La Guerre nous en révèle un dérivé qui est un nom masculin (accord avec **שבעה** en vi 2, avec **שלישי** en vi 3, avec **יצאו** en viii 11) faisant au pluriel **זרקות** (vi 2. 16; viii 11). Le contexte nous apprend qu'il s'agit d'une arme de jet (vi 2; viii 11), qu'on énumère à la suite des flèches (vi 16) et qui comprend une flamme (ou: pointe) sur laquelle on peut graver des inscriptions: „Eclair de lance” ou „Flamme de l'épée” (vi 2-3). Tous ces renseignements convergent vers le sens de „javelot” ou de „javeline” et cette arme ne se distinguait peut-être que par ses dimensions, plus grandes ou plus petites, de celle qui est mentionnée en vi 3 sous le nom de **זיק**, précisément pour caractériser le **זרק** par un terme de même sonorité. L'idée d'asperger a pu facilement donner naissance à celle de „jeter” comme on le constate dans l'hébreu michnique (Tosephta, Jom. 84, 1) et dans l'hébreu moderne; d'ailleurs en arabe „javelot” se dit précisément **مزرقات**, comme le fait remarquer M. DELCOR.

הגר (vii 4) figure dans une liste d'infirmités, après les boiteux et les

¹⁾ *Megillot Genouzot*, p. 25.

²⁾ „Les Anciens Manuscrits Hébreux récemment Découverts”, *Revue Biblique* 1949, p. 215.

³⁾ Par un curieux hasard, soit **הטל** soit **יטילו** pourraient aussi venir du verbe **נטל**, mais le sens de „lever” est exclu par vi 4, où s'impose au contraire celui de „jeter, lancer, tirer”.

⁴⁾ Plus littéralement, „dès le jet du premier” car **הראישון** n'est pas épithète de **הטל** dont le hé ne doit pas être pris pour un article.

ugles. Comme la racine **הגר** signifie „attacher”, on imaginera volontiers que ce terme désigne les paralysés.

חליף (xvi 12) se rattache à la racine **חלף** qui indique une idée de changement, mais dont nous ne connaissons que le verbe **חלף** „passer, remplacer” et le nom très rare **חלף** „remplacement” (Nombr. ii 21. 31). Cette nouvelle forme confirme tout à fait le sens biblique : une autre rangée de soldats sortira comme „rechange pour le combat”, on la traduction de M. DELCOR. En style militaire, on dirait „la relève”.

נחשור. En i 9. 10 l'éditeur transcrit **נחשיר** une forme bizarre où M. DELCOR propose de voir un „mot d'origine perse documenté en épigraphique”, auquel il attribue le sens de „carnage”. En attendant qu'il fournisse la preuve de cette explication, une autre mérite peut-être d'être suggérée. Comme le copiste ne distingue pas le waw et le vav, on pourrait lire **נחשור** tout aussi bien que **נחשיר** et alors cette forme serait l'infinitif absolu niqtal de la racine **חשר**. Cette racine, attestée peut-être en 2 Sam. xxii 12, l'est nettement en araméen pour signifier „cribler”. Et le crible est précisément une image biblique employée pour dépeindre une épreuve terrible (Am. ix 9; Is. xxx 28 et Eccl. xxii 31). On pourrait donc traduire i 9 par „les Kittim d'approcher¹⁾ et d'être criblés” et i 10 par „(les Kittim) s'approcheront pour être criblés”. En fait, cet infinitif doit, comme **הטל**, avoir un sens presque nominal, puisqu'il est précédé de la préposition **ל**, et donc se traduirait volontiers par „s'approcheront pour le criblage”, mais en comprenant par là le fait d'être criblés et non pas l'action de cribler. Dans le reste de l'ouvrage, l'orthographe de Qumrân ne permet pas de distinguer entre l'infinitif absolu **קטול** et l'infinitif construit **קטל**, écrit lui aussi **קטול**, mais dans le contexte immédiat on ne peut pas le confondre avec **הלוך ואור** (i 8) „ils iront en brillant”²⁾ où **הלוך** ne peut pas être confondu avec **לכת**. Peut-être d'autres solutions résoudront-elles ce problème posé par cette forme difficile. Celle-ci a l'avantage de s'en tenir à une racine sémitique existant peut-être déjà dans l'hébreu ancien et attestée jusque dans l'araméen récent. Qu'un terme

¹⁾ **קרב** est un infinitif construit, mais à l'intensif l'infinitif absolu est ordinairement remplacé par l'infinitif construit (Joüon, *Grammaire de l'Hébreu Biblique*, 117).

²⁾ M. DELCOR traduit „pour la marche et il y aura de la lumière”; il a donc calqué **ואור** au lieu de **נאור**, mais qu'a-t-il fait de **הלוך**?

persan ait été naturalisé en syriaque, on l'admettra sans peine, mais qu'il ait pénétré jusqu'en Palestine et dès le premier siècle avant notre ère, on aimerait en avoir la preuve (bien que l'exemple de נָדָן, ci-dessus, plus haut, montre que ce n'est pas impossible).

מִאֲסַף (iii 2; vii 13) La dernière des trompettes est appelée de ce nom parce qu'elle sonnait le „rassemblement” des troupes éparpillées pour les lancer ensuite à la poursuite de l'ennemi en déroute. La parenté est évidente avec la racine אָסַף „rassembler”.

מִפְּלִיגָה (x 12) se rattache à la racine פָּלַג „séparer” et ressemble fort à מִפְּלִיגוֹת de 2 Chr. xxxv 12 „les divisions, les branches” d'une famille, ainsi qu'au vocabulaire des Hymnes (viii 21) et du Manuel de Discipline (iv 15. 16. 17). Le contexte confirme cette interprétation: „les décrets de séparation pour le désert et la terre sèche”.

מִפְּשָׁע (viii 7) dérive de la racine פָּשַׁע „marcher”: on sonnera „pour la marche, jusqu'à ce qu'ils approchent du rang de l'ennemi”.

מִקְטָרָה (ii 5). Nous connaissons déjà deux dérivés de la racine קָטַר (encenser) avec la préformante mem: l'encensoir מִקְטָרֶת et l'autel מִקְטָרֶת. En voici un troisième qui doit signifier plutôt l'acte d'encenser, l'encensement, à peu près comme מִקְטָר d'Ex. xxx 1: les préposés aux sacrifices sont chargés „d'organiser un encensement d'agréable odeur”.

מִרְוֵגָה (v 13). A partir de רָגַל „pied”, notre auteur forme un verbe dénomiatif, différent de רָגַל „calomnier” ou „parcourir”, et signifiant en gros „être pourvu de pieds ou de jambes”. Le participe quitta que nous avons ici doit donc se vocaliser מִרְוֵגָה et il décrit sans doute un vêtement divisé en deux parties qui recouvrent les jambes.

מִשְׁרָתָה (xiii 4) L'auteur cherche manifestement un terme qui fasse pendant à מַחֲשָׁבָה et qui en reproduise plus ou moins la sonorité, donc avec une vocalisation probable en מִשְׁרָתָה ou מִשְׁרָתָה. M. DELCOR rattache ce mot à la racine שָׂרַת „servir” et donc il lui suppose un dérivé inconnu jusqu'à présent désignant „l'emploi” ou „le service”. Le sens général est fort admissible: „Maudit (soit) Bélial dans son dessein d'hostilité et injurié (soit-) il dans son emploi de culpabilité”. Peut-être pourrait-on envisager aussi le terme מִשְׁרָתָה, connu seulement par 2 Sam. xiii 9: „dans sa rotissoire de punition”, mais le parallélisme

ait moins régulier et surtout il y aurait là une allusion au feu de fer que rien ne confirme dans cet ouvrage.

צער (xii 9). Ce terme étant coordonné à „nos cavaliers”, on n'hésite pas à le rattacher à la racine צעד „marcher” et à comprendre „nos tassins”. Mais il ne semble pas qu'on ait affaire à un simple participe, qui, à Qumrân, s'écrirait צועדינו, et donc on supposera plutôt dérivé tel que צָעַד.

שטמ (xiv 9) appartient à la racine שָׁטַם „accuser, attaquer, persécuter”, que notre auteur préfère toujours à la forme jumelle שָׁטָן, d'où notre „Satan”. M. DELCOR traduit bien: „dans la domination de mal et dans tous les secrets de son adversité”.

Ces quelques remarques de philologie n'ont certes pas l'intérêt et l'importance d'une étude proprement théologique. Mais, en attendant que celle-ci puisse être réalisée, cet inventaire provisoire de quelques particularités linguistiques voulait simplement mettre à profit un des textes de Qumrân pour contribuer à une meilleure connaissance du vocabulaire biblique et donc à une plus exacte compréhension de la parole de Dieu.

THE FUNCTIONS OF GOD AS MESSIANIC TITLES IN THE COMPLETE QUMRAN ISAIAH SCROLL

BY

JOHN V. CHAMBERLAIN

Baltimore

There are indications in the complete Qumran Isaiah scroll (1QIsa) that some passages of Isaiah were understood messianically by the Essene community which produced the scroll which were not necessarily so understood by the keepers of the Massoretic tradition. For example, we may translate portions of chapter fifty-one from the scroll,

- 4 Attend to me, my people,
and give ear to me, my nation,
for TORAH will go forth from me,
and MY JUDGMENT I will establish as a light for peoples.
5 Near is MY RIGHTEOUSNESS;
MY DELIVERANCE has gone forth,
and *his* arms will rule the peoples.
In *him* the coastlands trust,
and for *his* arm they wait.
6 ... but MY SALVATION shall be forever,
and MY JUSTICE will never be confounded.
8 ... but MY JUSTICE shall be forever,
and MY SALVATION to the ages.

The only significant textual variants from the MT in the portions here translated are the three italicized pronouns. In the MT, there are all first person singular pronouns: "... *my* arms will rule the peoples. In *me* the coastlands trust, and for *my* arm they wait. In the MT the antecedent of these pronouns is understood to be the Lord. In the scroll the consistency of the pronouns in the third person singular precludes the possibility of accidental error, so we must seek another antecedent. This can be none other than MY DELIVERANCE (ישעי), with which "his arms" (זרועו, mistranscribed as זרועי, "my arms" in the American Schools edition) is in direct parallelism. Hence DELIVERANCE is personified as the agent of the Lord—the Deliverer who will rule for the Lord. BARTHÉLEMY notes this personification, and says; "Le passage a sans doute été appliqué

ontanément au Messie" ¹⁾). Since MY DELIVERANCE is parallel to TORAH (תורה), MY JUDGMENT (משפטי), MY RIGHTEOUSNESS (צדקי), MY SALVATION (ישועתי) and MY JUSTICE (צדקתי), these too are to be recognized as messianic names. Attributes and emanations of God are personified as descriptive names for the Messiah.

The use of TORAH as a messianic name recalls the work of W. D. DAVIES ²⁾ in demonstrating a messianic function for Torah in rabbinic Judaism, and showing that Paul regarded Christ as performing this function for Christianity. ". . . Not only did the words of Jesus form a Torah for Paul, but so also did the person of Jesus. In a real sense conformity to Christ, His teaching and His life, has taken the place for Paul of conformity to the Jewish Torah. Jesus Himself—in word and deed or fact is a New Torah" ³⁾. Thus, in orthodox Judaism and in two sectarian off-shoots of Judaism we observe the personification of the Torah with messianic attributes.

This personification was not limited to the concept of Torah, on the part of the Essenes. The same phenomenon we have seen with regard to Deliverance, Judgment, Righteousness, Salvation and Justice in Is. li 4-8. We may observe it again in Is. xlvi 10, which we translate from 1QIs^a.

MY COUNSEL shall stand,

and *he* shall accomplish all my purpose.

The MT reads "and *I* will accomplish" In the scroll, however, the change of pronouns necessitates a change in antecedents, and "my counsel" (עצתי) becomes the person who accomplishes all the purpose of God ⁴⁾.

This places a different cast upon the entire book of Isaiah. The

¹⁾ D. BARTHÉLEMY, „Le Grand Rouleau d'Isaïe Trouvé près de la Mer Morte", *Revue Biblique*, 57 (1950), p. 548, n. 2. BARTHÉLEMY treats these variants as possibly original, the MT readings being deliberate corruptions by scribes in order to erase the „prétexte aux espérances du messianisme temporel, bête noire des scribes comme du sacerdoce". This seems somewhat less than likely to us.

In addition to BARTHÉLEMY's work on this passage, see W. H. BROWNLEE, "The Christ as Salvation", *United Presbyterian*, Nov. 29 and Dec. 6, 1954.

²⁾ *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, London 1948, chap. 7.

³⁾ DAVIES, *op. cit.*, p. 170 f.

⁴⁾ Throughout the Manual of Discipline, as BROWNLEE has noted, עצה is ambiguous, meaning both "counsel" and "council". If the latter meaning was understood by the Essenes here, as seems likely, then the reference is to the Council of the Community" (i.e., "the Community acting in Council") as the corporate Servant of the Lord.

sense of the divine agent acting between God and man is sharpened. For example, in li 1:

Listen to me, you who eagerly follow **RIGHTEOUSNESS**,
you who seek the Lord,

RIGHTEOUSNESS is not to be considered as an abstract ethical quality but as the personal agent of the Lord. Notice that it is in parallelism to "the Lord". Again, in verse 7:

Listen to me, you who know **RIGHTEOUSNESS**,
oh people in whose heart is **MY TORAH**

the people of the Lord can be expected to understand this oracle because **RIGHTEOUSNESS** and **TORAH** are their Messiah. Text A of the Damascus Fragments opens with almost this exact phrase: "Listen all who know **RIGHTEOUSNESS**." **CHARLES** suggested that this use of **צדק** was a play on the name Zadok (**צדוק**), and cites the use of **צדק** in **מורה צדק**, "Teacher of Righteousness"¹). That is, when the readers of CDC and 1QIs^a read the summons to "all (you) who know **צדק**" he understood it to mean the followers of the Teacher of Righteousness²). Notice that the arm of the Lord is addressed in li 9 and 10 as a supernatural person—the personified power of God—even in the MT. Of course, this can be taken in a figurative sense, and no doubt should be so understood. But it is also possible to understand

Awake, awake!
Put on strength, O Arm of the Lord!

as an address to the agent of God, and this is apparently what the Essenes did³).

The concept of ethical qualities as descriptive names for the Messiah probably arose out of their use in the book of Isaiah as attributes of the Messiah. For example, even in the MT of xlii 1-4

¹) *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, II, p. 799, n. 1.

²) There has been much debate as to whether the sect considered the Teacher of Righteousness to be the Messiah. See ROWLEY, *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 34, n. 5, for the bibliography pro and con this identification. It would seem that the evidence is open to interpretation, and that we cannot, therefore, come to a certain decision until more evidence is available. There can be no doubt, however, that the Teacher was considered a messianic type. If not the Messiah, then a Prodomos preparing his way.

³) Cf. also liii 1 f., "To whom has the Arm of the Lord been revealed? He grew up . . .".

the Servant¹⁾ is the bearer of Judgment and Law. His agency as bearer of Judgment is heightened in 1QIs^a to a position of authority, for it is *his* Judgment:

Behold my Servant, I uphold him,
my Chosen, my soul delights (in him);
I have put my spirit upon him,
he will bring forth *his* judgment to the nations.

Both the MT and 1QIs^a recognize that it is *his* law which the Servant brings. The scroll, however, renders a plural.

He will not fail or be discouraged
till he has established judgment in the earth
and the coastlands wait for *his laws*.

Laws indicates not the idealized Torah, but, as the parallelism shows, *criteria for judgment*²⁾. It is clear, however, that this legal and judicial authority is attributable to the Servant.

In xxvi 8 in the scroll TORAH appears to make the transition from attribute of the Messiah to name of the Messiah. The MT of this verse may be translated:

Even (in) the path of your judgments,
O Lord, we await you;
the desire of our soul
is for your name and for your memorial.

There are significant differences in 1QIs^a. A long space after "your judgments"³⁾ shows that the sect understood "even the path of your judgments" with the preceding sentence—a perfectly logical interpretation. In addition, the pronominal suffix is absent from "we await", and "for your Torah" is read in place of "for your memorial". Thus, we translate the verse from 1QIs^a:

O Lord, we await your Name,
and the desire of our soul is for YOUR TORAH.

¹⁾ That the Servant and the Messiah may be identified is assured by the scroll reading of מִשְׁחָתִי ("I anointed") with reference to the Servant in lii 14, in the great Servant Song. I am convinced of this identification, although I must apologize for not taking space to defend it here.

²⁾ Cf. W. D. DAVIES, "Torah in the Messianic Age and/or the Age to Come", *Journal of Biblical Literature, Monograph Series*, vol. VII, 1952, p. 24, concerning the translation of תּוֹרָה in Jer. xxxi 33 by νόμος in the majority of mss of the LXX, "it may be that it (the plural) is used by the LXX so as to make it clear what the reference is—it is to the many demands of the Torah".

³⁾ This space, incorrectly shown *before* "your judgments" in the American Schools' transcription, is an example of a common interpretative device in the scroll. Sometimes the spacing agrees with modern versification (e.g. iii 17, 18) and sometimes a different division is apparent (e.g. vi 13).

The parallelism is much clearer than in the MT, and it coordinate "your Name" and "your Torah".

Even in the MT itself this personification of divine attribute sometimes occurs. In Is. lxii 11 we read:

Behold, YOUR DELIVERANCE comes,
 behold, his reward is with him,
 and his recompense before him.

The natural reading of this passage is to accept DELIVERANCE as the antecedent of the subsequent personal pronouns. This is how both the LXX and the Targum understood יִשְׁעךָ, for the LXX translates σωτηρᾶς, and the Targum פִּרְקִיךָ ("Deliverer" in both cases). As in the case of the scroll reading of li 5, this indicates that the Deliverance is not an abstract quality but a person. In fact the same word (יִשְׁע) is used for Deliverance in both cases. The question remains whether the author intended the reader to understand the Messiah or the Lord himself. It is not at all uncommon in OT poetry for God to be called by the name of the gift he brings. He is called "my help" instead of "my helper" (Ps. lxx 5), "my salvation" instead of "my savior" (Is. xii 2 and many other places), etc. Regardless of how the original author intended these to be understood, we can be sure, in the light of the scroll reading of li 5, that our sect interpreted many such references to mean the Messiah¹). Thus, while we can amply illustrate the inclination to personify the saving qualities of God in the MT, the tendency is heightened in the Isaiah scroll.

The closeness of the relationship between the Messiah and God also receives some emphasis in the scrolls that it does not receive in the MT of Isaiah. God acts on behalf of the Messiah. The Messiah possesses an almost divine authority. We may illustrate from Is. i 21 ff., translated from 1QIs^a.

How the faithful city has become a harlot,
 she that was full of JUSTICE!
 RIGHTEOUSNESS lodged in her,
 but now murderers.

.
 Therefore, the Lord, YHWH of Hosts,
 (the Mighty One of Israel), says:

¹) Cf. "a book of remembrance was written . . . for them that feared God and thought upon his name until DELIVERANCE and RIGHTEOUSNESS be revealed" (CDC ix 43), and "God will pardon them, and they shall see his SALVATION, for they trust in his holy name" (CDC ix 54).

"Wo! I will vent my wrath on *his* enemies,
and avenge myself on *his* foes.
He will turn my hand against you,

.....
Afterward you shall be called the city of RIGHTEOUSNESS,
....."

Zion shall be redeemed by JUSTICE,
and her penitents ¹⁾ by RIGHTEOUSNESS.

The material in parentheses is supplied from the MT where 1QIs^a has a lacuna. The only variants from the MT are the underlined pronouns. In the MT these are first person singular pronouns, whose antecedent is clearly the Lord. A third person singular masculine antecedent is not so apparent. "The Lord", "YHWH of Hosts" and "the Mighty One of Israel" are all in apposition, and are the antecedent of the first person pronouns. It is possible that "Israel" (understanding the True apocalyptic Israel) is the antecedent, but as this is used as part of a proper name for God, this is not probable. The only other masculine singular antecedents in the context are RIGHTEOUSNESS and its parallel JUSTICE. It is clear that these messianic names do not have a specific reference limited to the individual person of the Messiah, since they are said to have *formerly* dwelled in Jerusalem. The reference is apparently to the sect itself in its ideal nature. The replacement of Justice by harlots and Righteousness by murderers then is to be understood as the persecution and exile of the sect into the wilderness ²⁾. Hence, if we are to assume that the Essenes understood these verses as they were written by the sectarian scribe, then we must say that the passage was regarded by the sect as a promise by God to fight the enemies of the Messiah within Israel (the "murderers" who are now within the once-"faithful city". "City" [Jerusalem], like "Zion", stands for the nation Israel as a whole, though probably with special reference to the political and religious leadership of the nation). Furthermore, the Messiah has intercessory power with God, to turn the divine hand against (apostate) Israel. As verse 25 makes clear, this is for the purpose of refining Israel of his dross. We need have little doubt that the sect considered itself the pure ore of Israel, and understood the dross

¹⁾ שביה. Cf. the phrase "penitents of Israel" (שבי ישראל) as a name for the sect in CDC vi 1, viii 6 etc. Cf. also Is lix 20, "A REDEEMER comes to *Zion* and to *those who repent* (שב) of transgression in Jacob".

²⁾ This easy application of messianic titles, now to an individual, now to the sect as a whole is characteristic of sectarian theology.

upon which the Messiah would call God's vengeance to be the remainder of Judaism. The entire passage, which contains no allusions to the Messiah in the MT, becomes messianic from the Essene point of view.

The scroll reading of l 10 indicates that God heeds the voice of the Messiah, confirming the intercessory powers we discovered in i 25. There are two significant textual variants in l 10. The MT singular participial adjective ירא ("fearer") is a plural in the scroll (יראי), and the MT singular verb הלך ("he walks") is plural in the scroll (הלכו: "they walk"). These two variants force us to reinterpret the entire verse, however, because of their effect on the syntax. The singular participle שומע ("hearer") cannot be taken in apposition to the plural יראי ("fearers"), and the singular לו ("to him") cannot refer to the plural subject of הלכו ("they walk"). The net affect is as follows, translating first from the MT.

Who among you fears the Lord,
and obeys the voice of his servant,
who walks in darkness
and has no light . . . ?

(RSV)

Next we translate from the scroll.

Who among you are fearers of the Lord, Him who hears the
voice of His Servant?
Who (among you) walk in the darkness, where there is no
light?

The parallelism is not good here, and we may conclude that the MT reading is superior, but if we seek sectarian interpretation of the book of Isaiah, we must note that this sectarian scribe wrote that God heeds the voice of his Messianic Servant.

We conclude, then, that the sect was apocalyptically and messianically sensitive to a degree which caused the warping of their text of Isaiah, or at least this example of their text of Isaiah (for 1QIs^b displays a text almost incredibly close to the MT). This warping was in the interest of oracles which portray the Messiah as the personified qualities of God.

LA RÈGLE DE LA GUERRE

TRADUCTION ET NOTES

PAR

J. VAN DER PLOEG

Nimègue

*viro optimo H. H. Rowley
diem natalem 65um celebranti
24.3.1955 A.D.*

Le texte de la „Règle de la guerre”, édité par le professeur E. SUKENIK qui l'avait acheté de Bédouins de la tribu des Ta'amireh, et après sa mort par son fils Y. YADIN (אוֹצֵר הַמִּגִּילוֹת הַגְּבוּלוֹת שְׁבִידֵי הָאוֹנִיבְרִסְטָא הָעִבְרִית) Jérusalem תשט"ו = [décembre] 1954) avait été appelé par le premier éditeur „La guerre des fils de lumière contre les fils de ténèbres”. C'est sous ce titre que l'existence du texte avait été annoncée en 1948 et que quelques morceaux en avaient été publiés, mais il semble maintenant qu'on puisse le remplacer par un autre, plus simple et moins romantique: *serek ha-milhamāh* = „ordre (resp. règle) de la guerre”. Le document est en effet une règle, comme le Manuel de discipline, et le mot *serek* s'y rencontre plusieurs fois, tout comme dans le Manuel. Deux minces fragments de la Règle ont été publiés à part par J. T. MILIK et D. BARTHÉLEMY dans le premier volume des *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*. I (Oxford 1955), Pl. XXXIII, pp. 135-136. D'après une communication de J. M. ALLEGRO on a encore retrouvé d'autres restes de plusieurs manuscrits du Manuel de Discipline et de la Règle de la guerre ¹⁾ ce qui prouve que le texte en était populaire. Il semble bien que l'auteur de la Règle ait espéré que la guerre qu'il décrit en tant de détails aura lieu un jour, mais il est clair que pour en donner une description, il a puisé non seulement dans ses connaissances militaires indéniables, mais aussi dans sa phantasie.

La guerre est essentiellement une guerre sainte, menée, autant que possible, selon les indications de la Loi de Moïse et des autres livres saints qui décrivent les guerres d'Israël. On a l'impression que l'auteur s'est laissé inspirer d'abord par le Deutéronome, ce livre qui a si fortement inculqué aux Israélites de se séparer des autres nations et de leur faire une guerre implacable si c'est nécessaire pour la défense de la religion nationale.

Il y a dans la Règle des termes militaires difficiles à interpréter, ce qui semble indiquer que l'auteur connaissait la terminologie ou le jargon militaire de son temps. Mais ce qui s'oppose le plus à une bonne intelligence

¹⁾ Cf. *The Expository Times* LXVI, June 1955, p. 262.

du texte, c'est son état mutilé. Il a, en effet, subi le même sort, ou pire encore, que le *pešer* d'Habacuc: la partie inférieure du texte manque sur toute son étendue, il y a des lacunes au milieu du texte conservé, et à la fin il en manque probablement des colonnes entières. Le nombre moyen des lignes conservées entièrement ou presque entièrement, est de quatorze par colonne, et d'aucune colonne on ne voit plus que les restes de quatre autres lignes. Prenant comme norme les manuscrits des Psaumes d'action de grâce (*Hôdāyôt*) et du *Manuel de discipline*, L. ROST a évalué le nombre de lignes perdues à 7-10 par colonne¹); une troisième partie du texte serait donc perdue. Le critère employé par M. ROST semble un peu arbitraire et on peut arriver à de meilleurs résultats par l'analyse du texte de la col. iii, deuxième alinéa, tenant compte du début de col. iv (voir iii 17, notes). Ceci permet d'évaluer le nombre moyen de lignes par colonne à 21, ou tout au plus à 22, ce qui confirme la supposition de M. ROST. Il manque donc un peu moins d'un tiers de chaque colonne, ce qui rend l'interprétation de plusieurs passages extrêmement difficile.

En parcourant le texte et en observant qu'il présente parfois des répétitions (voir les notes) on est tenté de penser que l'auteur (ou le copiste) a été un compilateur et que le document est composite. Quant aux hymnes qu'il contient, il n'y a aucune difficulté de l'admettre; quant au reste, il semble sage d'être encore très réservé, à cause de l'état incomplet du texte. Des auteurs orientaux, tel que celui de la Règle, aiment les répétitions et dans une guerre il faut souvent répéter les mêmes manœuvres ou exécuter des manœuvres semblables. Seule une étude très approfondie du texte peut décider du caractère composite ou non-composite de celui-ci; ce qui est présenté ici au lecteur est seulement une traduction, suivie de quelques brèves notes. La traduction est aussi littérale que possible; je n'ai pas tâché de la faire en français littéraire, pour donner une meilleure idée de l'original hébreu qu'il importe avant tout de connaître.

La connaissance de l'art militaire de son temps que l'auteur trahit, a déjà été l'objet d'une étude de J.-G. FÉVRIER²) qui a pris comme base le texte de col. viii, tel qu'il avait été édité par E. SUKENIK dans le premier volume de ses *Megillôt Genūzôt*. Il conclut que la façon de combattre des Fils de lumière relève de l'art militaire hellénistique. Le passage en question a été traduit par R. TOURNAY (*RB* LXVI 1949, pp. 214 ss.) et d'autres, accompagné de la traduction d'autres passages publiés dans le premier volume des *Megillôt Genūzôt* (dans l'édition définitive col. xiv 2-14 et le fragment droit de col. xv 1-10). Dans le deuxième volume des *Megillôt Genūzôt* SUKENIK a publié le texte de Col. xii 10-16. On peut trouver des traductions de tous ces fragments e.a. dans G. VERMÈS, *Les manuscrits du Désert de Juda*, Paris 1953, pp. 193-196.

Une première traduction de la *Règle de la guerre* a été publiée par M.

¹) Cf. L. ROST, Zum „Buch der Kriege der Söhne des Lichts gegen die Söhne der Finsternis“, *ThLZ* LXXX, 1955, pp. 205-208.

²) J.-G. FÉVRIER, La tactique hellénistique dans un texte de 'Ayin Fashkha, *Semitica* III 1950, pp. 53-59.

DELCOR¹⁾; elle porte comme date février 1955 et a donc été faite dès la publication du texte. Elle est fort imparfaite et résout peu de problèmes. D'autres traductions ont été annoncées et peuvent avoir paru au moment de la publication de celle-ci, sans que j'ai pu les utiliser.

Le temps de la composition du texte de la Règle est difficile à déterminer. Beaucoup dépend de l'interprétation et de l'analyse littéraire du texte. Je penserais volontiers au deuxième siècle avant notre ère, au temps qu'on est encore en pleine lutte contre les Syriens, mais j'aime mieux réserver mon jugement là-dessus.

Les abréviations employées dans le commentaire sont les suivantes: DELCOR = article cité plus haut, M = texte masorétique; DSD = Manuel de discipline. Les traductions douteuses ou complètement hypothétiques ont été imprimées en caractères *italiques*; les mots ajoutés pour faire mieux comprendre le texte sont mis entre (), les parties manquantes du texte entre []; entre * * sont mis des mots qui traduisent des mots hébreux de la ligne précédente ou suivante. Des lettres hébraïques qu'on peut encore discerner mais qu'on ne peut pas traduire, ont été transcrites en caractères *italiques*. En employant des [] je n'ai pas tâché de donner une idée de l'extension du texte perdu.

TRADUCTION

I. Ligne 1. [Voici la règle pour ordonner] la guerre. Commencement de l'activité des Fils de lumière, pour attaquer le lot des Fils de ténèbres, l'armée de Bélial, la bande d'Edom et de Moab et des fils d'Ammon, / et la c[ontrée des habitants] de Philistie, et les bandes des Kitti'im d'Assour et ceux qui sont avec eux pour les aider, qui pêchent contre l'Alliance. Les fils de Lévi et les fils de Juda et les fils de Benjamin, les exilés du désert, se battront contre eux, / [] contre toutes leurs bandes, lorsque les exilés des Fils de lumière retourneront du désert des peuples pour camper dans le désert de Jérusalem. Et après la guerre ils s'en iront de là / [roi] des Kitti'im en Egypte et en son temps il sortira dans une grande colère pour combattre les rois du nord. Et dans sa colère il voudra détruire et briser la puissance / [de ses ennemis. C']est un temps de salut pour le peuple de Dieu et un temps de domination pour tous les hommes de son lot, et d'anéantissement éternel pour tout le lot de Bélial. Et il y aura / une g[rande] *panique* [pa]rmi les fils de Japhet, et Assour tombera et personne ne l'aidera, et l'empire des Kitti'im prendra fin, la méchanceté étant brisée sans qu'il en reste (quelque chose), et il n'y aura pas de réchappés / [pour tous les Fil]s de ténèbres.

¹⁾ M. DELCOR, La guerre des fils de lumière contre les fils de ténèbres ou le "manuel du parfait combattant" de Qumrân, *Nov. Rev. Th.* LXXXVII 1955, pp. 372-399.

8 [Des coups de foud]re illumineront tous les confins du globe, illuminant sans relâche, jusqu'à ce que toutes les assemblées de ténèbres soient détruites. Et dans l'assemblée de Dieu sa Majesté éminente
 9 resplendira jusqu'à toutes les fins / [de la terre,] pour la paix et la bénédiction, la gloire et l'allégresse et la longueur de jours de tous les Fils de lumière. Et au jour où les Kitti'im tomberont, ce sera la
 10 guerre, et une déroute énorme devant le Dieu / d'Israël; car c'est là le jour, dont il témoigne depuis longtemps, de la guerre d'extermination contre les Fils de ténèbres; en ce jour ils combattront jusqu'à la
 11 grande déroute. La communauté des Anges et l'assemblée / des hommes, les Fils de lumière et le lot de ténèbres se combattent, en la puissance de Dieu, avec le bruit d'une grande multitude, et il y aura en ce jour une alarme (de guerre) d'Anges et d'hommes. Ce temps en
 12 est un / de f[orte] détresse pour le peuple délivré par Dieu; et dans toutes leurs détresses il n'y en a pas d'aussi douloureuse, jusqu'à sa fin, pour la délivrance éternelle. Et au jour de leur guerre contre les
 13 Kitti'im / on cr[iera et ce sera la déro]ute dans le combat. Trois fois les Fils de lumière auront le dessus pour chasser l'iniquité et trois (fois)
 14 l'armée de Bélial se ceindra pour redresser le sort / [et toutes les uni]tés de l'infanterie s'efforceront à décourager le coeur (des ennemis), mais la puissance de Dieu forti[fi]e le coeur *des Fils de lumière*. Et
 15 au septième sort, la grande main de Dieu humilie / [Bélial et to]us les anges de son empire et tous les hommes [de sa congrégation].
 16 [tous] les saints il apparaîtra pour aider [] vérité pour l'extermination des Fils de ténèbres g [] / [] *yn* grand [] *m* ils donneront la
 17 main en tous(t) []

Col. II 1. cinquante-deux pères de la congrégation. Et ils classeront les chefs des prêtres après le grand-prêtre et son second, douze chefs,
 2 pour offrir / l'oblation perpétuelle devant Dieu. Et vingt-six chefs de groupes de service serviront dans leurs groupes de service, et après eux douze chefs de lévites pour assurer le service continuél,
 3 un / par tribu, et les chefs de leurs groupes de service assureront le service, chacun dans sa levée. Et les chefs des tribus et les pères de la congrégation (viendront) après eux, pour prendre place continuelle-
 4 ment dans les portes du sanctuaire. / Et les chefs de leurs groupes de service avec ceux qu'ils commandent seront présents à leurs fêtes, à leurs nouvelles lunes et à leurs sabbats et tous les jours de l'année,
 5 à partir de l'âge de cinquante. / Ceux-là présideront aux holocaustes et aux sacrifices, pour préparer une fumée agréable qui plaît à Dieu et qui le rende propice envers toute sa communauté, et pour se nourrir

toujours bien devant Lui / de la table de gloire. Ils assigneront leurs
 postes à tous ceux-ci au temps de l'an de la rémission, et pendant
 les trente-trois ans de guerre qui restent ils seront des hommes de
 renommée, / les hommes distingués de l'assemblée. Et tous les chefs
 de famille de la communauté se choisiront des guerriers pour tous les
 pays des gentils; de toutes les tribus d'Israël ils équiperont / pour eux
 des hommes de valeur pour partir en guerre, selon les proclamations
 de guerre d'année en année. Mais dans les années de rémission ils
 n'équiperont personne pour partir en guerre, car * c'est * un sabbat /
 de repos pour Israël. En trente-cinq ans de service, la guerre sera
 préparée pendant six ans, et toute la communauté la préparera en-
 semble; / et la guerre des divisions (sera menée) dans les vingt-neuf
 ans qui restent. Dans la première année ils feront la guerre contre
 Aram Naharaim, et dans la deuxième contre les fils de Loud, et dans
 la troisième / ils feront la guerre contre le reste des fils d'Aram,
 contre Ous et Houï, Tougat et Massa, qui sont de l'autre côté de
 l'Euphrate. Dans la quatrième et dans la cinquième ils feront la guerre
 contre les fils d'Arphaxad. / Dans la sixième et dans la septième ils
 feront la guerre contre tous les fils d'Assour et de Perse et des Orien-
 taux, jusqu'au Grand Désert. Dans la huitième année ils feront la
 guerre contre les fils / d'Elam. Dans la neuvième ils feront la guerre
 contre les fils d'Ismaël et de Qetoura. Et dans les dix années qui
 suivront, la guerre sera menée respectivement contre tous les fils
 de Ham / [selon leurs tribus, dans leurs habita]tions. Et dans les dix
 ans qui restent la guerre sera menée respectivement contre tous [les
 fils de Japhet dans leurs ha]bitations.

[]t alarme (de guerre) pour tout leur service po[ur] pour ceux
 qu'ils commandent / [] et des richesses sur []

. III 1. formations de combat. Et les trompettes qui les appellent
 (sonneront) lorsque les portes de guerre seront ouvertes pour que
 sortent les hommes de l'infanterie; et les trompettes de l'alarme (de
 guerre) des tués, et les trompettes / de l'embuscade, et les trompettes
 de la poursuite lorsque l'ennemi est mis en déroute; et les trompettes
 du rassemblement lorsque la bataille recommence. Sur les trompettes
 d'appel de la communauté on écrira „Appelés de Dieu”, / et sur les
 trompettes d'appel des princes on écrira „Princes de Dieu”, et sur
 les trompettes de la levée on écrira „Cadre de Dieu”, et sur les trom-
 pettes des hommes / de renommée on écrira „Chefs de famille de la
 communauté”. Lorsqu'ils se rassemblent (pour aller) à la maison de
 l'assemblée, on écrira (sur les trompettes) „Déclarations de Dieu au

- 5 Saint Conseil"; et sur les trompettes des camps / on écrira „Paix de Dieu dans le camp de ses saints"; et sur leurs trompettes de marche on écrira „Gestes puissants de Dieu pour disperser l'ennemi et pour
6 mettre en fuite tous ceux qui haïssent / la justice, et rétribution de honte pour tous ceux qui haïssent Dieu". Et sur les trompettes des formations de combat on écrira „Les formations des unités de Dieu
7 pour que se venge sa colère sur tous les Fils de ténèbres". / Et sur les trompettes d'appel des hommes de l'infanterie, lorsque les portes de guerre seront ouvertes pour qu'on sorte contre la ligne de l'ennemi,
8 on écrira „Souvenir de vengeance au temps fixé / de Dieu". Et sur les trompettes des tués on écrira „La main de la puissance de Dieu dans le combat pour faire tomber tous les tués (qui sont) traîtres". Et sur
9 les trompettes de l'embuscade on écrira / „Les (desseins) secrets de Dieu pour détruire l'iniquité". Et sur les trompettes de la poursuite on écrira „Dieu a battu tous les Fils de ténèbres; sa colère ne sera
10 pas apaisée avant qu'ils ne soient anéantis". / Et lorsqu'ils retournent du combat pour rentrer en ligne, on écrira sur les trompettes de retour „Dieu a rassemblé". Et sur les trompettes de la route de la rentrée /
11 de la guerre contre l'ennemi, pour aller à la communauté de Jérusalem, on écrira „Allégresse de Dieu lors du retour en paix".

13 Règle pour les enseignes de toute la communauté, selon leurs levées.

Sur la grande enseigne, qui précède tout le peuple, on écrira „Peuple de

14 Dieu" et le nom „Israël / et Aäron", et les noms des douze tr[ibus d'Israël] selon leurs générations. Sur les enseignes des chefs de camp

15 de trois tribus / on écrira b [et les noms des trois tribus. Et sur tr [l'enseigne]ne d'une tribu on écrira „Etendard de Dieu" et le nom du

16 prince de la [tribu] / jug[ement Et sur l'enseigne d'une myriade on écrira] le nom du prince de la myriade et les noms des c[ommandants des milliers. Et sur l'enseigne du millier on écrira ... et le

nom du commandant du millier et les noms des commandants] de ses centaines. Et sur l'en[seigne de la centaine on écrira]

Col. IV 1. Et sur l'enseigne de Mérari on écrira „Portion sacrée de Dieu" et le nom du prince de Mérari et les noms des commandants de ses milliers. Et sur l'enseigne du millier on écrira „La colère de

2 Dieu déborde contre / Bélial et contre tous les hommes de son lot, sans (leur laisser) un reste" et le nom du commandant du millier et les noms des commandants de ses centaines. Et sur l'enseigne de la

3 centaine on écrira „De / Dieu (vient) la puissance dans le combat contre toute chair criminelle" et le nom du commandant de la cen-

taine et les noms des commandants de ses dizaines (*sic*). Et sur l'enseigne de la cinquantaine on écrira / „[Par] la puissance de Dieu la position des méchants *a pris fin*“, et le nom du commandant de la cinquantaine et les noms des commandants de ses dizaines. Sur l'enseigne de la dizaine on écrira „Cris de joie / de Dieu, (accompagnés) du luth à dix cordes“, et le nom du commandant de la dizaine et les noms des neuf hommes sous son commandement.

Et lorsqu'ils partent au combat, on écrira sur leurs enseignes „Vérité de Dieu, justice de Dieu, gloire de Dieu, jugement de Dieu“ et après ceci toute la série de leurs noms (bien) exprimés. / Et lorsque le combat est proche pour eux, on écrira sur leurs enseignes „Droite de Dieu, temps fixé de Dieu, tumulte de Dieu, tués de Dieu“, et après ceci tous leurs noms (bien) exprimés. / Et lorsqu'ils retournent du combat, on écrira sur leurs enseignes „Dieu a élevé, Dieu a fait grand, louange de Dieu, gloire de Dieu“ et tous leurs noms (bien) exprimés. / Règle des enseignes de la communauté. Lorsqu'on part au combat on écrira sur la première enseigne „Communauté de Dieu“; sur la deuxième enseigne „Camp de Dieu“; sur la troisième / „Tribus de Dieu“; sur la quatrième „Familles de Dieu“; sur la cinquième „Unités de Dieu“; sur la septième „Appelés / de Dieu“; sur la huitième „Armées de Dieu“. Et on écrira leurs noms, (bien) exprimés, selon tout leur classement. Et lorsque le combat est proche pour eux, on écrira sur leurs enseignes / „Combat de Dieu, vengeance de Dieu, lutte de Dieu, rétribution de Dieu, force de Dieu, récompenses de Dieu, puissance de Dieu, anéantissement de Dieu de tout peuple vain“ et * on écrira* sur elles tous / leurs noms (bien) exprimés. Et lorsqu'ils retournent du combat, on écrira sur leurs enseignes „Actes de salut de Dieu, victoire de Dieu, aide de Dieu, soutien de Dieu, / joie de Dieu, louanges de Dieu, chant de Dieu, paix de Dieu“. [*Règle des mesures*]. L'enseigne de toute la communauté sera longue de quatorze coudées; l'enseigne de tr[ois tribus] sera longue de treize coudées; / [l'enseigne d'une tribu: do]uze coudées; l'enseigne d'une myriade: onze [coudées; l'enseigne d'un millier: dix coudées; l'enseigne d'une centaine: ne]uf coudées; / [l'enseigne d'une cinquantaine]: huit coudées; l'enseigne d'une dizaine: [sept coudées.]

l. V 1. et sur le b[ouclier] du prince de toute la congrégation on écrira [son] nom [et le] nom „Israël et Lévi et Aäron“, et les noms des douze tribus d'Israël selon leurs générations / et les noms des douze princes de leurs tribus.

Règle pour former les unités de combat, lorsque leur armée sera

pleinement équipée. Pour faire une ligne de front complète, une ligne
 4 comprendra mille hommes; et *chaque ligne aura* sept rangs / de
 front, disposés de façon que chaque homme soit placé derrière un
 autre. Et tous portent des boucliers de bronze poli à la manière /
 5 d'un miroir. Et le bouclier est encadré du travail d'un bord tressé, et
 de figures composées, travail d'artisan, d'or et d'argent et de bronze
 6 saillants, / et de pierres précieuses, ornementation multicolore, tra-
 vail d'artisan artistique. La longueur du bouclier est de deux coudées
 et demie et sa largeur d'une coudée et demie. Et dans leurs mains
 7 (ils tiennent) lance / et épée. La longueur de la lance est de sept cou-
 dées, à partir de la manche, et celle de la flèche d'une demi-coudée.
 8 Et sur la manche il y a trois anneaux, gravés, comme le travail / du
 bord tressé (du bouclier), d'or, d'argent et de bronze saillants, à la
 manière d'ornements de forme artistique; et ces ornements sont
 9 attachés des deux côtés de chaque anneau; / tout autour (il y a) des
 pierres précieuses, ornementation multicolore, travail d'artisan artis-
 tique, et l'épi. Et la manche est cannelée entre les anneaux comme le
 10 travail / d'une colonne artistique. Et la flèche est de fer blanc reluisant,
 travail d'artisan artistique; et une épi d'or pur (est plaquée) au milieu
 11 de la flèche, et elle se termine en pointe, dans la direction / de la sommité
 (de la flèche). Et les épées sont de fer fin et pur, de première qualité
 et blanchi comme un miroir, travail d'artisan artistique. Et une figure
 12 d'épi / d'or pur y est appliquée des deux côtés, et des rainures droites
 (vont) vers la pointe, deux d'un côté et deux d'un autre. La longueur
 13 de l'épée est d'une coudée / et demie et sa largeur de quatre doigts,
 et (celle) du fourreau de quatre pouces. Et jusqu'au fourreau il y a
 14 quatre largeurs de main, et le fourreau *s'étend*, d'un bout / à l'autre,
 sur cinq largeurs de main. Et la poignée de l'épée est de corne pure,
 travail d'artisan, (couverte) de travail multicolore en or et en argent,
 et de pierres précieuses.

16 Et lorsque se tiendra debout l'[armée] on disposera les sept
 17 lignes de combat, ligne derrière ligne / [tr]ente coudées, où se
 18 tiendront les hom[m]es] / [] de front []

Col. VI 1 sept fois et ils retourneront à leurs postes. Et après eux
 sortiront trois unités d'infanterie et elles se placeront entre les lignes.

2 La première unité lancera vers / la ligne de l'ennemi sept javelots de
 guerre. Et sur la flèche du javelot on écrira „Eclair de la lance
 selon la puissance de Dieu”. Et sur le second projectile on écrira /
 3 „Flèches ardentes de sang, pour faire tomber des tués par la colère

de Dieu". Et sur le troisième javelot on écrira „La flamme de l'épée dévore les tués méchants par le jugement de Dieu". / Tous ceux-ci lanceront sept fois et retourneront à leurs postes. Et après eux sortiront deux unités d'infanterie et se placeront entre les deux lignes; / la première *unité* portant lance et bouclier, la deuxième portant bouclier et épée, pour faire tomber des tués par le jugement de Dieu et pour humilier la ligne / de l'ennemi par la puissance de Dieu, pour rendre à tout peuple vain son mal. Et au Dieu d'Israël est la royauté et par les saints de son peuple il accomplira des gestes puissants.

Et sept rangs de cavaliers se tiendront, eux-aussi, à droite de la ligne de combat et à sa gauche; leurs rangs se tiendront des deux côtés; sept cents / cavaliers d'un côté et sept cents de l'autre côté. Deux cents cavaliers sortiront avec les mille d'une ligne d'infanterie. Et ainsi / ils se tiendront à tous les c[ôtés] du camp, tous ensemble quatre mille six cents. Et mille quatre cents chevaux pour les hommes du cadre des lignes, / cinquante pour ch[aque] formation. Et les cavaliers *seront sur* les chevaux des hommes du cadre, six mille cinq cents par tribu. Tous les chevaux qui sortent / au combat avec les hommes de l'infanterie (seront) des chevaux masculins, rapides, de douce voix, de longue haleine et ayant pleinement l'âge qu'il faut, exercés au combat / et instruits à écouter des commandements, et tous auront le même aspect. Et ceux qui montent sur eux (doivent être) des guerriers courageux, exercés (à monter) des chevaux; / et l'âge *qu'il leur faut* est de trente à quarante-cinq ans. Et les cavaliers du cadre seront âgés de quarante à cinquante ans, et ceux-ci / [] *wt* et les maisons des chefs et les rues. Et ils tiendront en leurs mains des boucliers de (peau) de veau et une lance longue [de huit coudées] / [] et arc et flèches et javelots de guerre. Et eux tous sont préparés *b[s] / []* et pour verser le sang de ceux qui seront tués à cause de leur culpabilité. Ceux-ci sont *b[]*

ol. VII 1. et les hommes du cadre seront âgés de quarante à cinquante ans, et ceux qui forment le cadre des camps seront âgés de cinquante à soixante ans, et les intendants / seront, eux aussi, âgés de quarante à cinquante ans, et tous ceux qui dépouillent les tués, et qui rassemblent le butin, et qui purifient la terre, et qui gardent les bagages, / et (celui) qui prépare la nourriture, tous ceux seront âgés de vingt-cinq à trente ans. Et aucun petit garçon ou femme n'entrera dans leurs camps lorsqu'ils quittent / Jérusalem pour aller au combat, jusqu'à ce qu'ils retournent. Et aucun boiteux ou aveugle ou paralysé

ou homme qui a un défaut permanent dans sa chair, ou homme
 5 frappé par une impureté / de sa chair, aucun de ceux-ci ne sortira
 avec eux au combat. Tous doivent être des hommes qui vont volon-
 tiers au combat, parfaits d'esprit et de corps et préparés pour le jour de
 6 vengeance. Et tout / homme qui ne sera pas pur quant au sexe au jour
 du combat, ne descendra pas avec eux, car de saints anges accompa-
 7 nent leurs troupes. Et il y aura une distance/ entre tous leurs camps
 et le lieu privé d'environ deux mille coudées, et aucune chose
 honteuse ne devra être vue autour de tous leurs camps.

9 Et lorsque les lignes de combat sont formées en face de l'ennemi,
 ligne en face de ligne, (alors) sortiront de la porte du milieu, pour se
 10 rendre entre les lignes, sept / prêtres de parmi les fils d'Aäron, vêtus de
 vêtements de bysse blanc, d'une tunique de lin et d'un caleçon de lin,
 11 et ceints d'une ceinture de lin de bysse, entrelacé de bleu / et de pour-
 pre et d'écarlate et de broderie multicolore, oeuvre d'artisan, et (ils
 auront) des turbans sur leurs têtes; (tous ces vêtements) seront des
 12 vêtements de guerre, et ils ne *les porteront* pas au sanctuaire. / Un
 des prêtres devancera tous les hommes de la ligne pour les encourager
 13 dans le combat, et les six (autres) tiendront à la main / les trompettes
 de l'appel et les trompettes de l'attention et les trompettes de l'alarme
 (de guerre) et les trompettes de la poursuite et les trompettes du
 14 rassemblement. Et lorsque les prêtres sortiront / pour se rendre entre
 les lignes, sept lévites sortiront avec eux, ayant à la main sept trompes
 15 de bélier; et trois intendants d'entre les lévites précéderont / les prêtres
 et les lévites. Alors les prêtres feront retentir deux trompettes d'ap[pe]l
 16 co]mbat *sur* cinquante boucliers / et cinquante hommes d'infanterie
 17 sortiront d'une des portes [] lévites intendants et les hommes / de
 toutes les lignes sortiront selon tout leur or[dre et alors sortiront les
 18 *hommes de l'infant]erie* des portes / [et ils se placer]ont entre les deux
 li[gnes] du com[bat]]

Col. VIII 1 les trompettes sonneront comme signal pour les frondeurs
 2 jusqu'à ce qu'ils aient fini de lancer sept/fois. Et après cela les prêtres
 feront retentir pour eux les trompettes du retour et ils retourne-
 3 ront au bord de la *première* ligne / pour se placer à leur poste.
 4 Alors les prêtres feront retentir les trompettes de l'appel, et / trois
 unités d'infanterie *sortiront* des portes et se placeront entre les
 5 lignes, et à côté d'eux les hommes de la cavalerie / à droite et à gauche.
 Alors les prêtres feront retentir les trompettes d'un son martelé,
 6 pour qu'on se mette en formation de combat, / et les chefs se ren-

dront à leurs formations, chaque homme à son poste. Et lorsqu'on aura pris place en trois rangs, / les prêtres feront retentir pour eux une deuxième alarme (de guerre) d'un son doux et appuyé, pour la marche, jusqu'à ce qu'ils se soient approchés / de la ligne de l'ennemi. Alors ils étendront leur main tenant les armes de combat. Et les prêtres sonneront l'alarme des six trompettes / des tués, d'un son aigu et agité, comme signal de combat. Et les lévites, et tous ceux qui tiennent des trompes, feront entendre / une seule alarme de guerre très forte, pour effrayer le cœur de l'ennemi. Et au son de l'alarme seront lancés / les javelots de combat pour faire tomber des tués. On accélérera le son des trompes et / les prêtres sonneront *des tro[mpe]-tes*, d'un son aigu, agité, comme signal de combat, jusqu'à ce qu'on ait lancé *sept fois* vers la ligne / de l'ennemi. Et ensuite les prêtres feront retentir pour eux les trompettes du retour, / d'un son doux, martelé, appuyé. Selon cette règle les prêtres sonneront pour les trois unités. Et au / premier lancement [*les prêtres et les lévites*] sonneront [*des trompettes et des trom*]pes, d'un son d'une alarme / puissante comme signal de guerre. Et au deuxième lancement] les prêtres [sonneront] pour eux / des tromp[ettes et ils se mettr]ont à leur place dans la ligne / [] et se tiendra debout

pl. IX 1. profaneront leur main pour faire tomber des tués. Et tout le peuple cessera (de faire entendre) l'alarme de guerre, et les prêtres feront retentir les trompettes / des tués comme signal de combat, jusqu'à ce que l'ennemi soit mis en déroute et ait pris la fuite. Et les prêtres feront retentir le signal du combat. / Et lorsqu'ils seront mis en déroute devant eux, les prêtres feront retentir les trompettes de l'appel, et tous les hommes de l'infanterie sortiront vers eux du milieu / des lignes de front, et six unités prendront position avec l'unité qui se bat, toutes ensemble sept lignes; vingt-huit mille / guerriers et six mille cavaliers. Tous ceux-ci poursuivront l'ennemi pour le détruire dans le combat de Dieu par un anéantissement / éternel. Et les prêtres feront retentir pour eux les trompettes de la poursuite, et on se divise[ra] (en groupes) contre tout l'ennemi, le poursuivant jusqu'à l'anéantissement, et les cavaliers / repousseront (l'ennemi) aux flancs du combat, jusqu'à la destruction totale. Et lorsque les tués tombent, les pr[êtr]es feront retentir l'alarme (de guerre) de loin, et ils ne viendront pas / au milieu des tués, de peur de se souiller par leur sang impur, car ils sont saints et ils ne doivent p[as] profaner l'huile de leur onction sacerdotale par le sang / d'un peuple vain.

0 Règlement pour une autre formation des unités de combat, pour

prendre position dans un *t[errain escarpé et de montagnes, pendant la*
 11 *guerre]* dans une région de rochers et de tours / ou d'*arc* et de tour
 et où on *peut difficilement marcher*. Les divisions sortiront et les aile
 12 *[se tiendront des deux]* côtés de la ligne pour *[effra]yer / l'ennemi*
 Et les boucliers des tours seront longs de trois coudées, et leur
 13 lances auront une *l[ongueu]r* de huit coudées; et les tours / sorten
 de la ligne. Chaque côté de la tour aura cent boucliers; to[us ceux-c
 14 couvrir]ont la tour des trois côtés de front, / trois cents boucliers
 Et chaque tour aura deux portes, *[une à droite et u]ne (autre) :*
 15 *gauche*. Et sur tous les boucliers des tours / on écrira: sur le premie
Mi[chel le Prince, sur le deuxième Gabriël, sur le troisième] Sariël
 16 *sur le quatrième Raphaël. / Michel et Gabriël l[] [les effectifs] de*
 17 *qua[tre lignes] ils mettro[nt] une [emb]uscade contre []*
 Col. X 1. nos camps et pour se ga[r]der de toute chose honteuse et
 mauvaise et ce qu'Il nous a fait savoir. Car Tu es au milieu de nous
 2 Dieu grand et redoutable, pour chasser tous / nos ennemis dev[an
 nous]. Et Il a appris jadis à nos générations: „Lorsque vous vous
 approchez du combat, un prêtre se tiendra debout et dira au peuple:
 3 / Ecoute donc, Israël, vous êtes aujourd'hui sur le point (de livrer
 combat contre vos ennemis; ne craignez pas et que votre cœur ne
 4 soit pas faible / et n'ayez pas pe[ur et ne soyez pa]s dans l'effrai devant
 eux. Car votre Dieu marche avec vous pour combattre pour vous
 5 vos ennemis, pour *vous* sauver”. / Et nos intendants diront à tous
 ceux qui sont prêts pour le combat, dont le cœur est généreux
 6 d'être courageux dans la force de Dieu; ils renverront tous / ceux qui
 ont peur et (ils exhorteront les autres) d'avoir courage avec tous les
 hommes vaillants. Et (ils répéteront) c[e qu'Il avait di]t par Moïse:
 7 „Lorsque la guerre viendra / dans votre pays contre un oppresseur
 qui vous opprime, vous ferez retent[ir] l'alarme de guerre (en sonnant
 8 des trompettes, et votre Dieu se souviendra de vous / et vous serez
 sauvés de vos ennemis”. Qui est comme Toi, Dieu d'Israël, dans le
 ciel et sur la terre? Qui fera des œuvres aussi grandes que les tiennes
 9 et des gestes aussi puissants que les tiens? Et qui est comme toi
 peuple Israël que Tu t'es choisi parmi tous les peuples des pays,
 10 un peuple de saints dans l'Alliance et au courant de la Loi, instruit
 dans la cr[ainte de Dieu] et qui écoutent la Voix majestueuse, et
 11 qui voient / les saints anges, qui ont les oreilles ouvertes et qui enten
 dent des choses profondes? *[Tu es le Dieu saint]* qui déploies les nuages
 12 l'armée des lumineux / et le poids des vents et l'empire des saints
 les trésors de ta gl[oire; qui étend les] nuages, qui crée la terre et le

lois de ses cours d'eaux / pour le désert et la terre aride, et tout ce qui y pousse avec ses fr[uits *selon leurs espèc*]es, le cercle des mers et le réservoir des fleuves et le jaillissement des abîmes, / ce que sont les animaux et les oiseaux, la structure de l'homme et les gén[erations de sa semen]ce, la confusion des langues et la division des peuples, l'habitat des tribus / et l'héritage des pays, [] les saints temps fixés, les cours des années et les temps / de l'éternité []*b*; ceci, nous le savons par ta connaissance que [] / [] *ké* vers notre clameur, car [] / [] sa maison *bé*[]

l. XI 1 car à toi est le combat, et par la force de ta main leurs corps ont été écrasés de façon qu'on ne les enterre pas. Et Goliath le Gattite, homme vaillant, / Tu (l')as livré dans la main de David ton serviteur, car il s'était confié en ton grand Nom, et non en épée et lance, car à Toi appartient le combat, / et Tu as hum[ilié] les Philistins de nombreuses fois par ton saint Nom, et Tu nous as encore sauvé de nombreuses fois par la main de nos rois / à cause de ta miséricorde et non selon nos œuvres, par lesquelles nous avons fait du mal, et (non selon) . s que nous avons commis. A Toi est le combat, et de To[i] vient la puissance / et non de nous-mêmes; et ce n'est ni notre force à nous, ni le pouvoir de nos mains qui ont agi puissamment, car (nous avons agi) par ta force et par le pouvoir de ta grande puissance, co[mme] Tu / nous l'avais *annoncé* jadis en ces mots: „Un astre est monté de Jacob, un sceptre s'est levé d'Israël, et il a frappé les tempes de Moab et le crâne de tous les fils de Seth” / et „il est sorti de Jacob et il a fait périr ce qui reste [d'une] ville” et „l'ennemi est conquis et Israël a agi puissamment”. Et par tes oints, / ceux qui voient tes témoignages, Tu nous as annoncé les t[emps] des guerres de tes mains, pour être glorifié en nos ennemis, pour faire tomber les bandes de Bélial, sept / peuples vains, par la main des pauvres que Tu sauves [par la forc]e et dans la paix, selon (ton) admirable puissance et (dans) l'effrai du cœur, pour (ouvrir) une porte d'espérance. Et Tu as agi envers eux comme (envers) Pharaon / et comme envers les officiers de ses chars dans la Mer Ro[uge]. Et ceux qui ont l'esprit abattu, Tu (les) fais brûler comme une torche de feu dans la paille, dévorant l'iniquité. Tu te ne retires pas avant que / les coupables soient exterminés; et depuis longtemps Tu les dé[t[r]uis p]ar la puissance de ta main, (montrée) aux Kitti'im, car Tu dis: „Et Assour est tombée sous une épée qui n'est pas d'homme; une 2 épée / qui n'est pas d'humains la dévorera”.

3 Car dans la main des pauvres Tu livres [les enne]mis de tous les

pays, et dans la main de ceux qui se courbent dans la poussière,
 14 pour humilier les forts des peuples, pour faire payer / les méchants
 leur c[ulpabilité] et pour exercer le jugement de ta vérité parmi tous
 15 les hommes, et pour Te faire un Nom éternel dans le peuple / [*que Tu*
t'es élu] les guerres, et pour te montrer grand et saint aux yeux du
 16 r[es]te des [peupl]es, pour qu'[ils] sachent / [] lorsque
 Tu f[ais] justice à Gog et à toute son assemblée, (à ceux) [qui se sont
 17 assemblés contre Toi]/[] car Tu combats parmi eux du (haut
 18 du) ci[el]] / [Tu les *rejetteras*] *lmhmb* []

XII 1 Car une multitude de saints [est à Toi] dans le ciel et des armées
 d'anges dans ta sainte demeure pour gl[orifier] ton [Nom]. Et les élus
 2 du peuple saint / Tu (les) as placés pour Toi parmi [*les vivants. Et le*
liv]re des noms de toutes leurs armées est chez Toi dans ta sainte
 3 habitation, et du no[m]bre des just]es, dans la demeure de ta gloire. / Et
 les faveurs de [ta bonne] bén[édiction] et ton Alliance de paix, Tu
 (les) leur a gravées avec le style de vie pour régner [] dans tous les
 4 temps de l'éternité / et pour visiter les ar[mées] de tes é[lus] selon
 leurs milliers et selon leurs myriades, ensemble avec tes saints. [Et
 5 Tu as destiné] tes anges pour avoir du pouvoir / dans la guerre, [Tu
 en as fait les veng]eurs de la terre lorsque Tu exerces tes jugements,
 et avec les élus du ciel ils sont v[ictorieux].

7 Et Toi, Dieu re[doutable] dans la gloire de ta royauté et (dans)
 l'assemblée de tes saints, (Tu es) parmi nous pour (nous) aider
 éternellem[ent]. Nous [ne sommes plus] (un objet) de mépris pour
 8 les rois, de moquerie / et de raillerie pour les puissants, car le Seigneur
 saint et le Roi de gloire est avec nous, avec des saints, des fo[rts],
 9 une armée d'anges, parmi nos effectifs. / Et le Fort du com[bat] est
 dans notre congrégation, et l'armée de ses esprits guide nos pas,
 et nos cavall[iers sont comme] des nuages, et comme des nuées de
 10 rosée couvrant la terre, / et comme une pluie abondante qui abreuve,
 par le droit, tout ce qu'elle produit. Debout, vaillant, amenez tes
 11 captifs, homme de gloire, et te rends maître / de ton butin, (toi) qui
 te montres puissant; mets ta main sur le nuque de tes ennemis et ton
 pied sur des amas de tués; écrase les peuples (qui sont) tes ennemis,
 12 et que ton épée / dévore la chair coupable; remplis ton pays de gloire
 et ton héritage de bénédiction, de bétail nombreux dans tes camps,
 13 de l'argent, d'or et de pierres / précieuses dans tes palais. Sion, réjouis-
 toi beaucoup, Jérusalem, apparais avec des cris de joie, et que toutes
 14 les villes de Juda exultent! Ouvre / [tes] por[tes] toujours pour qu'on

t'apporte la richesse des nations, et leurs rois te serviront et tous ceux qui t'humilient se prosterneront devant toi, et la poussière / [*de tes pieds, ils le lècheront. Les filles*] de mon peuple ont poussé des cris de jubilation, elles se sont ornées de leurs ornements de gloire et de parure. Par [la force] / [] Israël, pour régner éternellement. []/[*y*]*bm* des guerriers forts. Jérusalem [] / []*m* au-dessus des cieux, Seigneur []

II 1 et ses frères les [prê]tres et les lévites et tous les anciens du cadre avec lui. Et à leurs places, ils béniront le Dieu d'Israël et toutes les œuvres de sa vérité, et ils maudiront / là [Béli]al et tous les esprits de son lot, et il prendront la parole en disant: Béni soit le Dieu d'Israël dans toute sa sainte providence et (dans) ses œuvres de vérité. Et b[énis soi]ent / tous [ceux qui le serv]ent en justice, (ceux) qui le connaissent en fidélité.

4 Et m[audi]t soit Bélial dans son dessein hostile; qu'il soit maudit dans sa domination coupable, et que soient maudits tous les esprits de son lot dans leur dessein / mauvais. Qu'ils soient maudits dans toute l'œuvre immonde de leur impureté, car ils sont le lot des ténèbres, tandis que le lot de Dieu est pour la lumière/[éternel]le.

7 Et [Toi], Dieu de nos pères, nous bénissons ton Nom éternellement, et nous sommes le peuple [*de ton lot*]. Et Tu as [c]onclu une alliance avec nos pères, et Tu l'as tenue envers leur postérité / pour des périod[es] éternelles. Et dans tous les témoignages de ta gloire Tu t'es souvenu, parmi nous, de ta [*fidélité*], en aidant un reste et en conservant (le peuple de) ton alliance. / Et pour [*raconter*] les œuvres de ta vérité et les jugements de tes gestes puissants et admirables envers [nous, Tu nous a] fait pour Toi un peuple éternel, et Tu nous a fait tomber dans le lot de lumière, / selon ta vérité. Et jadis Tu as commandé à un prince de lumière de nous aider et de [*nous sauver et de nous encourager*]r, et (de même) à tous les esprits de vérité dans son empire. Et Tu / as fait Bélial pour nuire, l'ange de l'hostilité, et Tu l'[as fait tomber] dans les té[nèbres]; et il désire faire du mal et rendre coupable, et tous les esprits / de son lot sont des anges qui veulent nuire; ils marchent selon les lois des ténèbres et vers elles va tout leur dés[ir]. Et nous, dans le lot de ta vérité, nous nous réjouissons à cause de la main / de ta puissance et nous sommes joyeux à cause de ton salut, et dans l'allégresse à cause de [ton] sec[ours et de] ta [p]aix. 4 Qui est égal à toi en force, Dieu d'Israël? Et avec / les pauvres est la main de ta puissance. Et quel ange ou prince t'égale par rapport au secours que [*Tu nous prêtes merveilleusement?*] Depuis longtemps

15 Tu t'es fixé un gr[and] jour de guerre [*de destruction*] / [*pour faire connaître*]
la vérité et pour anéantir les coupables, pour abaisser les ténèbres et
16 fortifier la lumière, et pour [] / [*pour transporter le peuple de*
Dieu] à (sa) place éternelle, pour anéantir tous les Fils de ténèbres.
Et la joie pour []

18 []' Tu nous as témoigné *lm* []

XIV 1 comme le feu de sa colère contre les idoles d'Egypte.

2 Et après qu'ils se seront retirés des blessés pour rentrer au camp,
ils entonneront tous ensemble l'hymne du retour, et au matin ils
3 laveront leurs vêtements et se purifieront / du sang des cadavres des
coupables. Et ils retourneront à la place de leur poste où ils avaient
formé la ligne (de combat) avant que fussent tombés les tués de
4 l'ennemi. Et là ils béniront / tous ensemble le Dieu d'Israël et ils
exalteront son Nom avec joie en les mots suivants: Béni soit le Dieu
d'Israël, qui garde la miséricorde envers (le peuple de) son alliance,
5 et les promesses / de salut au peuple qu'Il a délivré. Et Il a dit aux
chancelants de [quitter la pris]on, et il a enlevé l'assemblée des nations,
pour les anéantir sans (qu'il en) reste et pour relever dans le jugement /
6 le cœur effrayé et pour ouvrir la bouche des muets pour qu'ils chan-
tent [tes] gest[es] puissants et qu'ils cessent d'apprendre la guerre; et
Il donne à ceux dont les genoux sont chancelantes de tenir fermement
7 (leur) place /, et (Il donne) la fermeté des reins au dos des abattus.
Et par les humbles d'esprit [*est obtenu*]ré le cœur endurci, et par
ceux dont la conduite est parfaite prendront fin tous les peuples
8 méchants /, et d'aucun de leurs hommes forts ne reste la place. Et
nous, le re[ste de ton peuple, nous louons éternellement] ton Nom,
Dieu de miséricorde, qui gardes l'Alliance envers nos pères, et à /
9 toutes nos générations Tu as accordé tes faveurs admirables, au
re[ste de ton héritage] dans l'empire de Bélial; et par tous les desseins
10 secrets de son hostilité ils ne [les] ont pas repoussés / de ton alliance,
et contre ses esprits [rebell]es Tu t'es emporté du [*haut de ta sainte*
demeure. Et contre les œuvr]es de son empire tu as protégé l'âme que
11 Tu as libérée, et Tu as fait se lever / ceux qui tombent, par ta puissance,
et les hommes de grande tail[le], Tu (les) as ab[attus sans qu'il en reste
(aucun)], personne ne sauve un seul de leurs vaillants. Pour aucun de
leurs hommes agiles il n'est de refuge, et leurs hommes de valeur, /
12 Tu les punis pour (leur) honte, et toutes leurs œuvres vaines, [*Tu*
les réduis à ri]en. Et nous, ton saint peuple, nous louons ton Nom
13 pour les œuvres de ta vérité, / et pour tes gestes puissants nous exal-

tons [ta] spl[endeur, en tous les] temps et en les temps fixés des témoignages éternels, à la v[enu]e du jour et de la nuit / et aux sorties du soir et du matin, car grand est [le dessein de ta fav]eur, et (grands sont) les décrets secrets de tes gestes admirables, dans les hauteur[s], pour [ériger] pour Toi [l'homme] de la poussière / et pour le faire (un peu) plus bas que les Anges.

Elève-Toi, élève-Toi, Dieu des dieux, dresse-Toi contre l'ou[trance de nos agresseurs]

nous avons [marché] dans les ténèbres et la lumière de ta grandeur y[] / Tu incendieras [tou]t pour être brûlé[]

V 1 Car c'est un jour d'angoisse pour Isra[ël] et de déclarat]ion de guerre à tous les peuples. Et le lot de Dieu sera délivré éternellement / mais tout peuple méchant sera anéanti. Et tout le pe[uple] et les hommes] de guerre s'en iront et dresseront leur camp en face du roi des Kitti'im et en face de toute l'armée / de Bélial, (l'armée de ceux) qui se sont réunis autour de lui pour le jour [en lequel ils périront] par l'épée de Dieu.

Et le grand-prêtre se tiendra debout, et ses frères les [prêtres, fils d'Aaron], et les lévites et tous les hommes du cadre avec lui. Et il dira à leurs oreilles / la prière du jour fixé pour la guer[re, et il communique]ra le plan de campagne et toutes les paroles de leurs hymnes. Et là il formera / toutes les lignes (de combat) comme il est éc[rit dans le livre de la Règle de la guer]re. Et le prêtre désigné pour le jour fixé pour la vengeance s'avancera, d'accord avec / tous ses frères, et il encouragera le[s hommes pour être forts dans le comba]t; et il prendra la parole et dira: Soyez courageux et fermes et soyez des hommes vaillants; / ne craignez pas et n'ay[ez pas peur dans le comb]at, et ne soyez pas alarmés, et ne les redoutez pas, et ne / reculez pas, et ne [] pas, car ils sont une congrégation méchante, et toutes leurs œuvres sont (accomplies) dans les ténèbres / et vers elles (va) [leur] dési[r]. Leurs bourgs et leurs gestes puissants sont comme de la fumée qui se disperse, et toute l'assemblée / de leur [mu]ltitude [sera anéantie et leur bras él]evé ne sera plus retrouvé, et il en sera vite fait de toute leur substance malheureuse / [au tem]ps où l'on che[rchera leur vie]. Prenez courage pour le combat de Dieu, car ce jour-ci est un jour fixé pour la guerre / [de la part de Di]eu contre tous les [méchants] contre toute chair. Le Dieu d'Israël élève sa main dans sa [puissanc]e admirable, / [et sur tous] les esprits mau[vais Les pui]ssants parmi les Anges se sont ceints pour le comba[t dans] les formati[ons des sa]ints, / [convo]quées pour le jour [] /

16 'l[]

17 pour éliminer b[]

18 dans sa perte h[]

XVI 1 jusqu'à ce que tous soient exterminés du sain[t *pays de son peuple, au jour où*] le Dieu d'Israël aura appelé l'épée sur toutes les nations, et (où Il) agira puissamment par les saints de son peuple.

3 Tout ce règlement, ils (l')observeront [en c]e [jour], lorsqu'ils auront pris position en face du camp des Kitti'im. Et après que les
4 prêtres auront fait retentir pour eux les trompettes / de l'attention, on ouvrira les portes du c[amp], et alors sort]ira l'infanterie, et les chefs se tiendront debout entre les lignes; et les prêtres feront
5 retentir pour eux / l'alarme (de guerre) pour qu'on se mette en position, et les chefs [*leur donneront des ordr*]es au son des trompettes, jusqu'à ce que chaque homme se soit mis à sa place. Alors *les prêtres* feront
6 retentir pour eux / l'alarme (de guerre) une deuxième fois, [*pour qu'on attaque l'enne*]mi; et lorsqu'ils se trouveront près de la première ligne (de combat) des Kitti'im, prêts à lancer (leurs javelots), chacun lèvera
7 sa main avec ses armes / de combat. Et six [prêtres feront retentir les tro]mpettes des tués, d'un ton aigu, continu, en signal de guerre.
8 Et les lévites et tous ceux qui tiennent / les trompes feront reten[tir l'alarme (de guerre) d'un] son fort. Et au moment où le son commence à retentir, ils souilleront leurs mains en faisant tomber des tués des
9 Kitti'im; et tout / le peuple fera cesser [sa] voix [terrifiante, et les prêtr]es feront retentir les trompettes des tués, et la guerre contre les Kitti'im continuera.

11 Et lorsque [*Bélial*] s'est ceint pour aider les Fils de ténèbres, et des tués de l'infanterie commenceront à tomber, selon les décrets secrets de Dieu, et pour éprouver par eux tous ceux qui ont été désignés
12 pour le combat, / les prêtres feront re[tentir] les tr[ompe]ttes de l'appel, pourqu'un autre ligne sorte pour (les) remplacer dans le combat, et ils se placeront entre les lignes. / Et pour ceux qui prenn[ent (en-
13 core) part] au comb[at], on fera retentir (le signal) de se retirer. Alors le grand-prêtre s'approchera, et debout devant la ligne il encouragera /
14 leurs cœurs dans [de Dieu] et leurs [main]s dans son combat.
15 Et il prendra la parole et dira: [*Le Dieu d'Israël a mis à l'épreuve*] le co[eur] de son peuple et Il a éprouvé quelques-uns de [ses élus], et
16 ne pas [] vos [t]ués, car vous avez entendu jadis / des décrets
17 secrets de Dieu [] *hm lyh*[] / *kg*[]

Col. XVII 1 et Il a placé leur salut dans les flamm[es de la colonne de feu];

et Il les a faits] des éprouvés au creuset; et Il a affilé leurs armes de guerre et ils ne faiblissent pas jusqu'à ce que [soit exterminée] / de l'injustice. Et vous, souvenez-vous du jugem[ent de Nadab et d'Abi]hou, fils d'Aäron, comment Dieu s'est montré saint, en les jugeant, aux yeux [de tout le peuple, et (comment)] / Il a raffermi pour Soi [*Eléazar*] et Itamar, pour (conclure avec eux) une alliance [d'un sacerdoce é]ternel.

Et vous, soyez fermes et ne les craignez pas. Ils sont, [en effet, du néant,] leur désir va vers ce qui est vain et rien, et leur soutien est sans f[orce]. / [Et] tout ce qui est et ce qui se fait *ne v[aincra] pa[s]* Israël, et [la vérité des faveurs de Di]eu (se montre) en tout ce qui se fait éternellement. Aujourd'hui, c'est son jour fixé pour humilier et abaisser le prince de l'empire / de l'iniquité. Et Il a envoyé au lot de son [témo]ignage une aide éternelle par la puissance de l'ange dont Il a fait son sublime serviteur, Michel, dans la lumière éternelle, / pour faire rayonner de joie les é[lus d'I]sraël, (pour donner) paix et bénédiction au lot de Dieu; pour exalter parmi les Anges la dignité princière de Michel, et l'empire / d'Israël sur toute chair. La justi[ce] se réjouira [dans] les hauteurs, et tous les fils de sa vérité pousseront des cris d'allégresse dans la connaissance éternelle. Et vous, fils de son alliance, / soyez fermes dans le creuset de Dieu, jusqu'à ce qu'Il agite sa main [et qu'Il] donne ses ordres secrets à (ses anges) qui (vous) mettent à l'épreuve, là où vous êtes placés.

Et après ces paroles les prêtres sonneront pour eux pour qu'on mette en formation les unités de la ligne (de combat). Et les chefs se répandront au son des trompettes / jusqu'à ce que [chacu]n ait pri[s sa] place. [Alors] les prêtres feront retentir une deuxième alarme de guerre, pour qu'on attaque. Et lorsque / les hommes [d'I]sraël auront *atteint* [la li]gne des Kitti[im], au moment du lancement chacun lèvera sa main avec ses armes de guerre, et les prêtres feront retentir les trompettes / des tués [et les lévites et tou]s ceux qui tiennent les trompes feront retentir l'alarme de guerre, et les hommes de l'infanterie en viendront aux mains avec l'armée / des Kitti[im]. [Et lorsqu'on aura entonné le son de l'ala]rme, ils commenceront à faire tomber des tués, et tout le peuple fer[a] cesser le son de l'alarme, et les prêtres / feront retentir [les trompettes de la poursuite et la guerre] / à ceux qui p[re]nnent la fuite devant eux / Et dans le lot des dép[ouil]leurs de tou]s les tués. / Miche]l [] l.

XVIII 1 [] Et lorsque se lève la grande main de Dieu sur Bélial et sur toute [l'étend]ue de son empire par une défaite éternelle / []

et l'alarme (de guerre) des saints dans la poursuite d'Assour; et les
 fils de Japhet tomberont pour ne plus se relever, et les Kitti'im seront
 3 battus sans / [*réchappés ou reste. Et au jour*] de la levée de la main du
 Dieu d'Israël sur toute la multitude de Bélial, en ce temps les prêtres
 4 feront retentir / [les trompett]es de l'attention, et toutes les lignes de
 combat se rassembleront vers eux, et elles se diviseront (pour marcher)
 5 contre toutes les *b*[abitations des Kitt]i'im / pour les ruiner, [*avant*
que] le soleil ne se hâte de se coucher. En ce jour-là, le grand-prêtre
 6 se tiendra debout, et les prêtres et les [lévites] qui sont / avec lui, et
 les chefs et les hommes] du cadre; et là ils béniront le Dieu d'Israël,
 et ils prendront la parole en disant: Béni soit ton Nom, Dieu [*des*
 7 *dieu*]x; car / Tu as fait grandes [*tes œuvres*] en faisant des merveilles,
 et Tu as gardé pour nous ton Alliance depuis jadis, et de multiples
 8 fois Tu nous a ouvert les portes de salut, / à cau[se de *ton grand Nom*
et de ta misérico]rde envers nous, et Toi, Dieu de [j]ustice, Tu as agi à
 [cause] de ton Nom.

10 [] admirable et dès l'origine rien n'a été fait comme ceci. Car Tu
 11 connais notre heure, et aujourd'hui est apparu / à [nous]*b* avec
 nous pour la délivrance éternelle, pour mettre fin à jamais à l'e[m]pire
 12 de l'en]nemi. Et la main de ta puissance / et les *bau*]teurs de ton pays
sont tombés su]r nos ennemis, jusqu'au désastre complet. Et mainte-
 nant, aujourd'hui, aide nous vite, dans la poursuite de leurs multitu-
 13 des, car Tu / [*et la grai*]sse des vaillants, Tu(l')as livrée (à
 nous), jusqu'à ce que (leur) place ait disparu. De Toi est la puissance,
 14 et le combat est en tes mains, et personne / [*ne peut échapper* à]
 tes [*main*]s; et il y a des temps fixés selon ta bonne volonté, et de la
 15 *r*[étributio]n []*kb*, et Tu humilies l'em]pire / de Bélial []

XIX 1 [v]aillants, car saint est notre (Dieu) fort, et le Roi de gloire
 2 est avec nous; et la *j*]ustice / *ro*]sée pour [c]ouvrir la terre, et comme
 3 une pluie très forte pour tremper de justice t[out le *globe*. / Prend]s
 ton butin, (toi) qui te comportes vaillement; mets la main sur la nuque
 4 de ton ennemi, et ton pi[c]d, [*mets-le sur* / *leurs corps*,] et ton épée
 dévorera de la chair. Remplis ton pays de gloire, et t[rempe] ton
 5 héritage de bénédiction [/ *et que la* soit dans] tes palais. Sion,
 réjouis-toi beaucoup, et toutes les villes de Ju[da], poussez des cris
 6 d'allégresse [/ car à toi vient la] richesse des nations, et leurs rois te
 7 serviront et se prosterneront devant toi [/ ; filles de] mon [peup]le,
 faites éclater une voix d'allégresse; parez-vous d'une splendide parure
 8 et [/]*kb*, et Israël pour régner [é]ternellement [/] cette nu[i]t-là

pour le repos jusqu'au matin, et au matin [/ les hé]ros des Kitti'im et la multitude d'Assour et l'armée de tous les peuples [/] ils tomberont là par l'épée de Dieu, et là le gra[nd]-prêtre s'approchera [/] guerre, et tous les chefs [des] lignes (de combat) et les command[ants / tou]s les [t]ués des Kitti'im. Et là ils louer[ont] Dieu d'Israël [/]

NOTES

Col. i. lignes 1-7. Par une déchirure du rouleau cette colonne a été séparée de la partie droite du manuscrit, de façon qu'un ou deux mots manquent au début de chaque ligne. L'éditeur pense avoir retrouvé cette partie, bien qu'incomplète; on y voit seulement les premières lettres des lignes 1-9, 13 et les premiers mots des trois lignes 10-12. A l'aide des ces derniers mots il a fait la jonction avec le gros de la colonne, de façon que les lignes 10-11 sont maintenant entières. Les mots des deux morceaux se suivent bien et donnent un texte intelligible. La seule difficulté qu'on puisse avoir contre cette jonction, c'est qu'il faut supposer que le morceau droit s'est notablement rétréci sur toute la largeur du rouleau (voir Pl. XVI). Que ce rétrécissement n'a rien d'anormal pour un morceau conservé séparément et desséché, est attesté par D. BARTHÉLEMY à propos d'un autre morceau de la première grotte de Qumrân¹). On peut donc donner raison à SUKENIK et accepter sa reconstruction (partielle) de la première colonne du texte conservé; alors il est en même temps clair que c'est la première colonne de tout le texte (voir la Planche). Ligne 1. Les premiers mots manquent; on pourrait les compléter ainsi: [וזה סרך לסדר]. Pour משלוח cf. Is. xi 14, où la même expression signifie „butin”; on pourrait se demander si le même sens ne s'impose pas ici, le texte parlant alors des prémices du butin. Puisqu'il semble que le texte parle plutôt d'activités militaires tout court, d'une défaite infligée aux ennemis et non de butin, il est plus indiqué de donner à יד משלוח son sens naturel: activité de la main. Le mot להחל est probablement une forme de חול II (GESENIUS *Wb.*) = fondre sur, frapper, cf. Jér. xxiii 19; xxx 23 (la tempête); Os. xi 6 (l'épée); Thren. iv 6 (les mains). Le mot גורל est traduit ici et dans la suite par „lot”, ce qui en rend imparfaitement le sens, car dans la Règle il signifie plutôt „ce qu'on obtient par le sort”, donc „possession”, „domaine”, etc., et même un groupe d'hommes qui „appartiennent” p. ex. à Bélial. Les „Fils de ténèbres” et les „Fils de lumière” sont connus de DSD i 9-10, où le mot *gōrāl* se retrouve également.

Ligne 2. Compléter ainsi: [והחביל יושבי], cf. Soph. ii 5, où les mêmes mots se retrouvent dans un autre ordre. Ce complètement, et beaucoup d'autres qui suivront encore, est évidemment hypothétique; ce n'est qu'un choix fait entre plusieurs possibilités. Les „Kitti'im d'Assour” sont men-

¹) *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*, I, p. 108: „... les fragments s'étant rétractés depuis sous l'effet de la sécheresse, nous avons préféré les éditer dans leur état initial...”

tionnés ici pour la première fois; si „Assour” n’est pas une cryptographie désignant un peuple que l’auteur ne veut pas nommer (ce dont on n’a aucune preuve dans tout le texte de la Règle), il est le plus naturel de penser à la Syrie des Séleucides. L’expression *מְרִשְׁעֵי בְרִית* se retrouve Dan. xi 31 au même sens: ce sont les Juifs qui se sont alliés aux oppresseurs de leur peuple, soit par complaisance, soit par peur, et qui négligent ainsi leurs devoirs envers la Loi. — On a l’impression que l’auteur, en nommant les Edomites, Moabites, Ammonites, Philistins, Kittî’îm d’Assour, a en vue non seulement les anciens ennemis d’Israël, mais plus particulièrement la partie syro-palestinienne de l’empire séleucide. Contre ces ennemis le petit groupe de fidèles des tribus de Lévi, Juda et Benjamin commencera à guerroyer: ce sera le commencement, ou le prélude, de la guerre sainte contre tous les peuples. Les fidèles sont appelés la „*gôlāb* du désert”, ce qui rappelle DSD viii 13.

Ligne 3. Le début de la ligne peut seulement être deviné; le premier mot pourrait être *כּוֹלֵם* et le deuxième une expression qui signifie „combattre”, „frapper”, etc. Le désert est appelé ici le „désert des peuples” expression prise d’Ez. xx 35, où elle semble désigner le grand désert arabe, situé entre la Palestine et la Mésopotamie. La région de Qumrân pouvait être considérée d’en faire partie; puisque l’auteur de la Règle cite une parole de l’Ecriture qu’il adapte aux circonstances de son temps, il n’est pas nécessaire que la localisation soit rigoureusement la même que dans le texte d’Ezéchiel. Le „désert de Jérusalem” est probablement le pays situé à l’est de la ville, s’il faut prendre cette expression au sens littéral, ce qui n’est pas certain. Il semble donc qu’on veuille s’emparer de Jérusalem la marche des trois tribus vers l’est a donc déjà un but militaire. Du résultat de l’opération il n’est rien dit, mais lorsqu’elle est terminée, on s’en ira de là, probablement vers le sud (cf. ligne 4).

Ligne 4. Les deux premiers mots manquent; les premières lettres du premier peuvent bien être *וַי*, *waw* + préformante de l’imparfait d’un verbe („aller à”? „combattre”?). Après le verbe un substantif serait bien à sa place et on peut se demander si ce n’est pas *melek* (cf. xv 2); la suite du texte demande en effet un singulier masculin, désignant quelqu’un qui pourra faire la guerre aux „rois du nord” (même ligne). Dans Dan. xi 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 15, 40 le „roi du nord” (toujours au singulier) est le roi d’Antioche. Les „rois du nord” peuvent donc bien être le roi de Syrie et ses rois-alliés. Si cette interprétation est juste, le texte dit que la „*gôlāb* du désert”, après avoir fait la guerre, ou la guérilla, aux armées séleucides, se rendra en Egypte en attendant le moment que le roi de ce pays combattra ses ennemis syriens en laissant la main libre aux Fils de lumière.

Ligne 5. Le commencement d’un alef est encore visible comme début de la ligne; lire *אֵיבֵי הַיָּאָה*. Pour l’expression *qeren ‘ôyēbāw*, cf. Thr. ii 17 (*qeren sārāik*). La victoire sur les adversaires du peuple de Dieu est décrite en des termes exultants: le pouvoir sera rendu au „lot” du peuple de Dieu, tandis que le „lot” de Bélial, c.-à-d. les adversaires, sera détruit.

Ligne 6. La reprise du pouvoir par les Fils de lumière sème la panique parmi les peuples japhétites. La liste de ces derniers est donnée Gen. x 2-6, où sont nommés e.a. les Grecs, les Mèdes, et plusieurs autres peuples

qui ont fait partie (du moins partiellement) de l'empire des Séleucides.

Ligne 6. Premiers mots ג[דולה ל]בני (au lieu de לבני on pourra lire בבני). On a bien l'impression que c'est la fin de l'empire séleucide qui est prédite. Les Syriens avaient de nombreux mercenaires venant des îles grecques et d'autres pays, cf. 1 Macc. vi 29.

Ligne 7. Lire: לכלול בני חושך]

Lignes 8-15. Nouvelle description de la guerre en termes apocalyptiques.

Ligne 8. A cause de l'allusion manifeste à Ps. lxxvii 19 (cf. Ps. xcvi 4) le sens des deux premiers mots manquants est certain, mais pour le premier des deux on peut choisir entre plusieurs synonymes: חצי, זיקי, זויי ou un autre; lire p. ex. [זיקי ברק]. L'entrée en action de Dieu est décrite en les termes d'un orage, cf. Jos. x 11; etc. Du haut du ciel Dieu aide les siens.

Ligne 9. Premier mot: תבל, ou une expression synonyme. Il s'agit encore une fois de la chute des Kitti'im, qui semblent être les mêmes que ceux dans le passage précédent, jusqu'à la preuve du contraire. Le mot *naḥšîr* est d'origine perse; on le rencontre en syriaque au sens de „chasse”, métaphoriquement „carnage”, „destruction”. S. Ephrem l'emploie dans ses *Carmina Nisibena* (édition de G. BICKELL, *S. Ephraemi Syri Carmina Nisibena*, 1866; index p. 54, traduction pp. 147, 9), où il fait dire par la mort: „C'est moi qui, sur mer et sur terre, ai fait tous les *naḥšîrîn*”. Dans la Règle le mot désigne la déroute complète de l'ennemi, en même temps que le carnage qui accompagne ce désastre. Un sens secondaire du mot est celui de *venator*, *bellator* (PAYNE-SMITH, *Thesaurus Syr.*).

Ligne 10. La défaite des Fils de ténèbres avait été prédite par Dieu depuis jadis, donc par les paroles des prophètes d'Israël. Pour exprimer que cette prédiction a été faite sans interruption, l'auteur emploie l'imparfait du verbe; יעוד = il témoigne constamment (voir également Règle xvii 1). Après le mot לנחשיר le texte est interrompu, sans qu'on en comprend la raison, par un petit espace vide où il y aurait de la place pour un ou deux mots. Le même phénomène se rencontre assez souvent dans le texte du rouleau, et la meilleure explication en est peut-être que le cuir était tel qu'à certains endroits le copiste n'y pouvait pas écrire. Ceci explique au mieux pourquoi à maints endroits, où l'on trouve ces espaces vides sans raison apparente, le texte ne semble pas avoir souffert ni être incomplet (cf. viii 13; xi 7; etc.). La עדת אלים ne peut être l'assemblée de dieux qui n'existaient pas pour les gens de Qumrân; les *ēlīm* sont donc plutôt des anges, probablement les plus grands d'entre eux. Dans le texte des Septante d'Is. ix 5 l'expression אל גבור (μεγάλης βουλῆς) ἄγγελος, ce qui prouve que pour les juifs alexandrins du 2^{me} siècle le mot *ēl* pouvait désigner un ange de haut rang.

Ligne 11. Il semble qu'il y ait un anti-climax dans les expressions: les Anges combattent l'assemblée des hommes, les Fils de lumière se battent contre les Fils de ténèbres. La גבורת אל n'est pas seulement la force, la puissance de Dieu, mais aussi la manifestation de sa puissance, donc ses gestes puissants, accomplis souvent par les hommes qu'Il emploie comme ses instruments. Pour le sens de תרועה, voir l'étude de P. HUMBERT, *La „Terou'a”: analyse d'un rite biblique* (Neuchâtel 1946); ici c'est l'alarme, la

clameur de guerre, les cris que poussent les guerriers et le son des trompettes et des trompes qu'on fait retentir. Le **יום הוה** est le jour qui est, existe, soit au présent, soit au futur.

Ligne 12. Le deuxième mot peut être lu **ע[זה]**. L'expression **מחישה עד תומה** peut être comprise de différentes manières; dans la traduction, le premier verbe a été compris comme participe de **חוש** = sentir des douleurs (en araméen **חשש**), et pour **עד תומה** on peut comparer **עד תומם** = jusqu'à la fin, Jos. viii 24; x 20; Dt. ii 15. Le jour du combat futur sera douloureux, du commencement jusqu'à la fin, donc entièrement, mais ce sera pour la délivrance éternelle des justes.

Ligne 13. Les premiers mots peuvent être lus comme **י[צ]עק לנח[שיר]** ou **י[צ]רחו לנח[שיר]** (pour *srh* = pousser des cris de guerre, cf. Is. xlii 13). La seule fin de la guerre contre les Kitti'im ne peut être que leur destruction totale, mais la victoire contre un tel ennemi n'est pas facile à obtenir. L'expression **שלושה גורלות** semble signifier ici „trois fois”, comme si le sort avait été jeté avant de commencer. Les Fils de lumière attaqueront trois fois, trois fois l'ennemi tâchera de lancer une contre-attaque; dans sa quatrième attaque, la septième dans tout le combat, l'armée des Fils de lumière, aidée par Dieu, vaincra.

Ligne 14. Premiers mots **י[וכול דג]לי**? Le terme **הבנים** rappelle, comme on l'a déjà remarqué, 1 Sam. xvii 4, 23 (Goliath). Les guerriers qui appartiennent au groupe des **בנים** opèrent entre les deux camps, même entre les deux lignes (**מערכות**), cf. xvi 4; ils sont armés comme Goliath pour lutter corps à corps. On peut les comparer à notre infanterie, et faute de mieux ce nom est employé dans la traduction. La deuxième lacune pourrait être complétée ainsi: **מאמן צת לבני אור**.... **בגורל**; il ne manque qu'un mot de trois ou quatre lettres, ou bien il faut remplacer **אור** par une autre expression.

Ligne 15. Commencement: **ל[בליעל עם כו]ל**? Fin **י[עצתו]**?

Lignes 16-17. Texte trop fragmentaire pour pouvoir être complété.

Col. ii. Le sujet traité est différent de celui de la première colonne, dont la partie perdue a dû contenir le commencement du nouveau paragraphe. Il s'agit maintenant de l'organisation de la communauté de Qumrân en temps de guerre, une guerre qui durera quarante ans.

Ligne 1. Le nombre des cinquante-deux chefs de famille correspond sans doute à celui du nombre des semaines de l'année. Le grand-prêtre est le chef de la communauté, établie, sans doute, à Jérusalem après la défaite des Syriens. Il a un „second” qui puisse le remplacer, et il y a douze chefs de familles sacerdotales qui viennent en rang après les deux. Aux derniers siècles de l'existence du deuxième temple, les prêtres et les lévites étaient divisés en 24 classes (*mišmārôt*) qui assuraient le culte dans le temple; les Israélites „laïcs” étaient divisés de la même façon en 24 classes et dans un but pareil: pour assister aux sacrifices au nom de tout le peuple. Chaque semaine un groupe de prêtres (**מעמד**) assurait le service, et un groupe d'Israélites y assistait (cf. E. SCHÜRER, *Geschichte* ... II, pp. 337-338). Les usages de la communauté de Qumrân, du moins celles qu'on se figurait de venir en vigueur lors de la réinstallation à Jérusalem, n'étaient pas les mêmes; 52 pères de la communauté et 12 chefs de prêtres

devaient régler le service quotidien, appelé en hébreu *tāmīd*. Pour le reste, voir les lignes suivantes.

Ligne 2. A côté des cinquante-deux et des douze il y avait 26 chefs de *mišmārôt* (voir ci-dessus). Douze chefs de lévites devaient servir continuellement (תמיד, non תמיד comme au commencement de la ligne), un pour chaque tribu.

Ligne 3. L'expression „un pour chaque tribu” suppose qu'Israël sera composé de douze tribus, comme dans les anciens temps, ce qui étonne après i 2, où ne sont mentionnés que Lévi, Juda et Benjamin. On peut donc penser que la partie inférieure perdue de col. i a parlé de la conversion de toutes les tribus (cf. Ez. xxxvii 15-28), ou bien que l'auteur cite une nouvelle source. Pour le sens de מעמד, voir ci-dessus, ligne 1. Les chefs des tribus et des grandes familles d'Israël viennent en rang après les prêtres et les lévites; leur fonction sera d'être toujours présents dans les portes du sanctuaire, non pour les garder, semble-t-il, mais pour former le sénat du peuple.

Ligne 4. Les פקודים seraient, d'après l'usage normal de ce mot, les „préposés” (Num. xxxi 14, 48), mais ici le sens passif semble mieux à sa place („ceux qui sont commandés”). Les chefs des *mišmārôt* et ceux qu'ils commandent doivent être présents dans le temple tous les jours de fête pour représenter le peuple.

Ligne 5. Tous, prêtres et lévites, doivent avoir soin que les sacrifices soient offerts comme il faut.

Ligne 6. La „table de gloire” est l'autel de Dieu, cf. Mal. i 7, 12 („table de Jahvé”), et Ez. xlv 16 („ma table”). Les personnes en charge seront installés l'an de la *šemittāb*, identique, pour les gens de Qumrân, à l'année sabbatique (pour le terme cf. Dt. xv 1 ss.; pour l'idée Ex. xxiii 10-11; Lévi. xxv 3 ss.). De quelle année sabbatique s'agit-il, puisqu'elle sera suivie de 33 ans de guerre? Il y a là une énigme que L. Rost a essayé de résoudre dans l'article cité ci-dessus (voir plus haut, p. 374). Sa supposition que la guerre en question est une guerre de quarante ans est juste, mais sa *computatio temporum* ne l'est pas, en partie puisqu'elle est fondée sur une fausse interprétation du texte de la ligne 9¹⁾. Si l'on suppose que la guerre comprendra d'abord 6 ans de préparation (ligne 9), la septième année est la première année sabbatique et c'est celle-ci dont il est question. Cette année sera suivie par 33 années de guerre, qui auront, elles-aussi, leurs années sabbatiques.

Ligne 7. Pour l'expression קרואי מועד cf. Num. i 16; xxvi 9; ce sont ceux qui sont „appelés”, dont on entend souvent nommer les noms.

Le mot בחרים ne peut être autre chose que le participe présent du qal, écrit sans *waw*. Ce sont les chefs patriarcaux des familles qui choisissent les guerriers; dans Num. i 3-4 Moïse et Aäron le faisaient, aidés d'un chef de famille de chaque tribu.

Ligne 8. Pour l'expression יצא לצבא cf. Num. xxxi 27. Les תעודות המלחמה sont les déclarations officielles de la guerre, faites publiquement

¹⁾ M. Rost a compris la forme verbale תעריך comme 2me personne de l'impératif, ce qui aurait été תעריך dans la graphie du manuscrit.

dans les assemblées de la communauté, donc les décisions solennelles de partir en guerre contre tel ou tel pays. Pendant les années sabbatiques le repos doit être complet et on n'a même pas le droit de faire des préparations pour la campagne suivante. A des contre-attaques des ennemis l'auteur ne semble pas penser; sa confiance en Dieu est telle qu'il est convaincu que la question ne se pose même pas. Des pieux du premier temps de la lutte des Maccabéens se laissaient massacrer, plutôt que de se défendre le jour du sabbat (1 Macc. ii 34-38); on en tira vite la conclusion qu'on devait changer de conduite et qu'il fallait se défendre chaque fois et chaque jour qu'on était assailli; pour l'attaque on réservait les autres jours de la semaine.

Ligne 9. Etant donné que toute la durée de la guerre est de $6 + 1; 6 + 1; 6 + 1; 6 + 1; 6 + 1; 6 + 1; 5$ ans, il s'ensuit qu'il y a 35 années d'activité de guerre, si on y inclut les six premières années dans lesquelles elle est „préparée” par tout Israël (une partie d'Israël part en guerre, tout Israël la prépare).

Lignes 10-13. Les divisions de l'armée mèneront la guerre contre divers peuples distincts; ils doivent combattre 29 ans, ce qui est parfaitement en accord avec la division de la guerre indiquée ci-dessus. Les 29 années sont divisées en trois périodes, dans lesquelles on combattrait successivement les peuples qui descendent de Sem, de Ham et de Japhet, donc tous les peuples du globe. Dans l'énumération de leurs noms l'auteur suit en grandes lignes Gen. x 21 ss. Le premier peuple à attaquer est Aram Naharaim, qu'on doit chercher en Mésopotamie (Gen. xxiv 10), probablement au cours moyen de l'Euphrate. Il n'est pas clair si „le reste des fils d'Aram” (ligne 11) est une expression qui résume les quatre peuples qui suivront: „Ouz et Houl, Tougat et Massa, qui sont de l'autre côté de l'Euphrate” (cf. Gen. x 23). Le mot חורר de la Règle peut être le résultat d'une métathèse du mot חור de la Genèse¹); ce ne serait pas la seule fausse transcription de noms rares dans le texte de l'Ancien Testament. Quoi qu'il en soit, on a l'impression qu'il s'agit de tribus araméennes de l'autre côté de l'Euphrate, car l'auteur énumère les différents peuples dans un ordre assez géographique et cela est logique, car les campagnes militaires mènent les Israélites toujours plus loin de leur pays. L'identification d'Arphaxad n'est pas certaine; certains pensent aux Chaldéens, car selon Josèphe Arphaxad est l'éponyme des Chaldéens (cf. *Ant. Jud.* I 6, 4). Selon Judith i 1, 5 Arphaxad est le nom d'un roi mède. Il semble donc bien que la guerre contre Arphaxad mène les Fils de lumière encore plus loin de leur pays qu'ils ne l'avaient déjà été. Dans la 6^{me} et 7^{me} année on fait la guerre „à tous les fils d'Assour et de Perse et des Orientaux”. Ces deux années comprennent au moins deux campagnes, séparées par une année sabbatique; les Assyriens et les Perses habitent, du moins en partie, les montagnes. On va jusqu'au „Grand Désert”, dont la situation géographique est difficile à déterminer; peut-être le grand désert intérieur de la Perse, pour les gens de Qumrân la fin du monde habité? Dans Dt. ii 7 c'est plutôt le désert qui se trouve entre l'Egypte et la Palestine. Elam se trouve encore plus loin, au sud de la Perse. Les fils d'Ismaël et de Qetoura sont les tribus arabes qui peuplent le désert à

¹) *Tougat* semble apparenté à *Tigris*.

est de la Palestine; ce ne sont pas des peuples organisés comme les autres, aussi la guerre contre eux n'est-elle peut-être qu'une action d'épuration, ce qui expliquerait pourquoi elle est nommée en dernier lieu.

Après l'énumération précédente, qui compte douze peuples (si les descendants d'Ismaël et de Qetoura, tous descendants d'Abraham, sont pris comme un seul peuple), l'auteur mentionne en bloc les „fils de Ham” et sans doute aussi les „fils de Japhet” (ligne 14, lacune). Pour lui l'ennemi venait surtout du nord et du nord-est, comme presque toujours dans l'histoire d'Israël. Si notre interprétation des différents noms de la première catégorie est juste, il n'y est pas fait mention spéciale du grand ennemi syrien du territoire tyro-palestinien. Les „fils d'Assour et de Perse” sont pris comme unité et il semble donc qu'ils ne sauraient être identifiés aux Syriens de la plaine d'Antioche, d'Aleppe, de Damas et d'autres villes. De tout ceci on pourrait tirer la conclusion prudente que la guerre contre les nations n'est pas dirigée contre les Séleucides, puisqu'elle aura lieu après la défaite définitive de ceux-ci et de la réinstallation des gens de Qumrân à Jérusalem. On peut encore ajouter qu'il n'est pas impossible qu'Aram Naharaim est nommé comme premier pays voisin de l'Israël restauré, dont les frontières idéales sont indiquées Jos. i 4.

Ligne 14. Commencement: ל[משפחותם במן] שבותם; fin de la ligne: כול [בני יפת במן] ושבותיהם.

Ligne 16-17. La ligne 15 a été laissée ouverte par l'auteur, pour marquer la fin d'un grand passage. Des lignes suivantes, il ne reste que quelques mots et des débris d'autres, qui semblent avoir appartenu au début de la description de la préparation de la guerre.

Col. iii. lignes 1-11. Dans ce passage l'auteur nous donne une description des trompettes de guerre, de leur usage et de leurs inscriptions; la guerre est en pleine préparation, et les instruments nommés doivent apparemment être fabriqués dans les six années préparatoires.

Ligne 1. Les „portes de la guerre” sont, ou bien les portes du camp, ou les portes de la ville où l'on se trouve. Les armées hellénistiques aimaient à camper dans des villes ou des villages; les premières avaient évidemment des portes. Les villes fortifiées avaient aussi des portes spéciales, étroites, qu'on employait pour des sorties en temps de guerre (poternes). On sait que les camps militaires des Romains étaient pourvus de portes, généralement quatre, une de chaque côté; dans la direction où se trouvait l'ennemi était la *porta praetoria*, par laquelle on partait au combat. Ce n'est pas cette porte romaine dont il est question ici, car le mot est au pluriel. Il faut se rappeler également que l'Ancien Testament parle déjà des portes d'un camp, cf. Ex. xxxii 26, 27 et 2 Chron. xxxi 2 („les portes du camp de Jahvé”). Dans 1 Macc. iv 7 il est question d'un camp bien fortifié de l'armée syrienne qui devait par conséquent avoir des entrées, donc des „portes”.

Num. x 2 ordonne la fabrication de deux saintes trompettes d'argent, la Règle prescrit d'en faire un plus grand nombre, pour être employées dans les différentes phases du combat.

Ligne 2. Les trompettes portent des inscriptions sacrées et belliqueuses, qui avaient quelque rapport avec l'usage qu'on devait en faire. L'auteur aime les assonances, ici comme en d'autres cas pareils (cf. iv 3).

Ligne 3. Pour le sens de המסורות cf. Num. xxxi 5 (DELCOR), où *msr* veut dire „mobiliser, lever des troupes”. Le mot *serek*, fréquent dans les règles de Qumrân, signifie „ordre”, „règle”, mais il semble signifier également „ceux qui donnent des ordres”, donc le „cadre” des troupes; ce sens pourrait bien avoir été visé ici (cf. les autres inscriptions, qui contiennent toutes des titres).

Ligne 4. Le deuxième mot יכתובו est pourvu de points qui servent de *deleatur*; selon le copiste, ou un correcteur, l'expression est de trop. Puisque le mot est pourtant bien placé, il en faut conclure que le correcteur a comparé le texte du manuscrit avec celui d'un autre, ou d'autres, et que la Règle était donc un ouvrage bien connu dans la communauté de Qumrân. Le *bêt mô'ed* est le temple ou toute autre maison où l'on se rassemble. Dans Job xxx 23 la *shéol* est appelée une „*bêt mô'ed* pour tous les vivants”.

Ligne 6. Le mot ומשיב est difficile à interpréter et peut être compris de deux façons. Ou bien c'est un participe *hifil*, dépendant de *el* (ligne 5) Dieu donne des grâces à ceux qui le haïssent; ou bien c'est un substantif au sens de „rétribution”, mais l'hébreu ne connaît que le mot משובה ayant cette signification. Le mot חסדים peut difficilement signifier „grâces” l'idée que Dieu donne ses grâces à ceux qui le haïssent étant absolument étrangère à l'auteur de la Règle; il doit donc être pris au sens de „honte” cf. Prov. xiv 34; Lévi. xx 17; cf. aussi Prov. xxv 10; Sir. xiv 2.

Ligne 7. Le mot מערכה a été traduit ici et ailleurs par „ligne”, ce qui n'en rend pas exactement le sens; c'est plutôt une division ou un corps d'armée, ou même une partie de celle-ci, qui est prête à combattre.

Ligne 8. „Trompettes de l'embuscade”; encore dans 1 Macc. xi 68 on lit le récit des exploits d'une embuscade syrienne, opérant contre les Juifs.

Ligne 9. Les *rāxê el* ne sont pas des mystères surnaturels qui dépassent la capacité de l'intelligence humaine, comme les mystères de la foi chrétienne, mais les décrets secrets de Dieu, qu'il a pris jadis et qu'il exécute dans le temps. Ce sens du mot est clair et certain; plus tard il sera même question des *rāxê* (= desseins secrets) de Bélial (xiv 9).

Ligne 11. Jérusalem est censée être le siège ou le quartier général de la communauté; les „portes de guerre” dont il a été question plus haut (ligne 3) peuvent donc bien être celles de la ville.

Lignes 13 ss. Après les trompettes, les enseignes (אותות)! Selon Num. ii 2 ss. chaque *bêt abôt* avait son enseigne. D'après Règle iv 15 ss. ces „enseignes” étaient de longues bannières, dont la plus grande ne mesurait pas moins de quatorze coudées.

Ligne 14. Lacune: ש[בטי ישראל]ל. L'auteur n'a pas en vue un camp romain mais il pense à la description du camp des Israélites dans le désert au temps de Moïse et d'Aaron (Num. ii 2 ss.). Selon cette description les tribus étaient rangées en groupes de trois, chaque groupe sous un chef spécial ayant chaque sa bannière. Cette façon de grouper des troupes était tellement sacrosainte aux yeux des Juifs qu'ils supposaient que les anges du ciel n'étaient pas disposés autrement (cf. H. L. STRACK & P. BILLERBECK *Kommentar z. N.T. aus Talmud u. Midrasch*, III, 1926, pp. 806-807).

Lignes 15-17. Le mot נשי (ligne 15; col. iv 1) n'est pas le pluriel construit de אשה = femme (DELCOR), mais l'état construit du mot *nāšî'*, écr

sans *aleph*. Les lignes 15-17 sont très lacuneuses et il ne reste presque rien de la dernière, mais l'allure générale du texte permet d'en rétablir la plus grande partie. Les bannières sont au nombre de huit et on peut raisonnablement supposer qu'elles ont été décrites toutes de la même façon stéréotypée; puisqu'on n'en trouve rien dans le texte de la colonne suivante, il est facile à calculer qu'après la ligne 17 manquent au moins deux autres lignes. Puisque iv 1 semble être la suite d'une description des enseignes spéciales de la tribu de Lévi, il est raisonnablement certain qu'à la fin de la col. iii l'autres lignes manquent encore. Etant donné que iv 1 mentionne Mérari, la dernière des trois grandes subdivisions de la tribu de Lévi, on peut supposer aisément que le texte perdu a fait mention des bannières de la tribu de Lévi et de celles des familles de Gerson et de Qehat. Si l'on suppose maintenant (c'est l'élément incertain du calcul) que les textes de leurs bannières n'étaient pas beaucoup plus longues que ceux des autres, deux lignes auront été suffisantes pour la description de leurs bannières, ce qui porte le nombre de lignes de la col. iii à 21, ou tout au plus à 22.

Col. iv. Ligne 1. Mérari est le nom du troisième fils de Lévi; si sa famille est mentionnée ici on a toute raison de penser que les deux autres n'auront pas été oubliées lorsque le texte était encore intact. Moïse, en effet, descendait de Qehat, et l'auteur ne peut pas avoir oublié cette famille. Le nom d'Aaron figure déjà sur la grande bannière de tout le peuple (cf. iii 14). Pour נשי = prince, cf. iii 15. Après Mérari sont énumérés les milliers, les centaines, les cinquantaines et les dizaines de la tribu.

Ligne 3. Le mot עשרותיו „ses dizaines” est une erreur non corrigée du copiste (au lieu de „ses cinquantaines”). Quant aux textes à écrire sur les bannières, l'auteur a de nouveau recherché les assonances: *Mérari - terûmat; elef - af el; mē'āh - mē'et el; ḥamišim - ḥādāl ma'amād; 'asārāh - nebel 'asôr.*

Ligne 4. Troisième mot: גבורה [ב].

Ligne 5. L'emploi du mot תעודה est à noter; les „neuf hommes de sa t^{te} *ūdāh*” sont les neuf hommes que le commandant de dix *commande*.

Lignes 6-8. Lorsqu'on partira au combat, on inscrira encore d'autres devises sur les bannières; on a l'impression qu'il s'agit ici des bannières de Lévi, puisque celles de la communauté sont mentionnées plus bas, lignes 9-14.

Ligne 6. L'expression פרוש (*pērûš* dans le dictionnaire de JASTROW) désigne l'expression complète et exacte des noms. Il s'agit probablement des mêmes noms que ceux dont il avait été question plus haut, et alors on se demande avec étonnement pourquoi ils doivent être inscrits une deuxième, troisième, quatrième fois sur les bannières.

L'acte d'inscrire des noms avait-il un sens sacré, voire magique? Avait-on des bannières distinctes pour les diverses phases des opérations militaires, comme il y avait plusieurs trompettes à ce but?

Lignes 9-14. Les „bannières de la communauté” sont au nombre de huit, ce qui signifie qu'il y en a huit espèces, selon les subdivisions de la communauté, ce qui ressort des inscriptions.

Ligne 14. Commencement: שמתחת [ח].

Lignes 15-17. Le texte est fort abîmé mais en partie facile à restaurer, puisqu'il décrit selon un système uniforme les mesures des bannières sacrées.

La plus grande est celle de tout le peuple; chaque suivante est moins longue d'une coudée. De leur largeur le texte conservé ne dit rien. Ligne 15. commencement: [אות רבנא]? Ligne 16, deuxième lacune: [סרך מן]?

Col. v. lignes 1-2. Les premières lignes contiennent les derniers renseignements relatifs aux paroles à écrire sur les boucliers des soldats. La fin de col. iv a contenu le début de ces renseignements. L'usage d'écrire des textes sur des instruments de guerre doit être vieux et elle est encore pratiquée maintenant, de façon officielle et inofficielle; elle correspond donc à un instinct humain naturel. Chez les Fils de lumière tout devait avoir un sens religieux.

Lignes 3-14. La description de la formation des lignes de combat et de leurs armes contient des expressions difficiles à comprendre. Du point de vue technique et philologique ce passage est le plus difficile de tout le texte conservé de la Règle. L'interprétation qui en est donnée ici est proposée avec encore plus de réserve que celle d'autres passages difficiles.

Ligne 3. L'expression **לסדר** doit être lue comme un infinitif (cf. ligne 16). La *degel* est une unité de l'armée (Num. i 52; Cant. ii 4), comme il ressort clairement de certains papyri d'Eléphantine¹). Puisque les bannières de mille hommes portent comme inscription *daglé el* (cf. iv 10) on peut penser que mille hommes était l'effectif du *degel*, du moins dans le texte de la Règle (tout en supposant qu'il est partout uniforme et d'une seule pièce, ce qui est plus que douteux). Pour **בהמלא** = ... équipée, cf. 2 Sam. xxiii 7 et 2 Rois ix 24. L'expression **מערכת פנים** est probablement un terme militaire technique; il revient col. ix 4. Il y a lieu de se rappeler ici que beaucoup de Juifs ont servi comme soldats dans les armées hellénistiques et qu'il est donc normal qu'un certain nombre d'entre eux étaient au courant de la terminologie militaire et de l'art de faire la guerre de ces armées. Sans aller loin de leur pays, ils pouvaient même savoir quelque peu de l'art militaire romain en plein deuxième siècle avant J.-C., car il est connu qu'Antiochus IV Epiphanes avait un corps de 5000 hommes armés à la romaine²). L'incise **על אלף איש תאסר המערכה** (si c'est bien une incise) est difficile, car on n'en trouve pas d'équivalent dans l'Ancien Testament. Pour **אסר** cf. Os. x 10 et l'interprétation qu'en donne H. S. NYBERG dans ses *Studien zum Hoseabuche*, 1935, p. 79. Le sens de l'expression est donc peut-être: mille hommes composent une „ligne de front”. Pour **על** cf. (peut-être) vii 15 (texte mutilé).

Ligne 4. Le texte est obscur pour nous. D'accord avec v 16, vi 8 ss. et d'autres textes on dirait que la longueur de la ligne est de 1000 hommes, et qu'il y en a sept, l'une placée derrière l'autre; le sens de **מערכה** serait donc

¹) Cf. A. COWLEY, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.*, 1923, p. 12.

²) Cf. E. BIKERMAN, *Institutions des Séleucides*, Paris 1938, p. 56. L'organisation de l'armée des Séleucides est décrite pp. 50-105 de cet ouvrage. Les soldats de parade de l'armée d'Antiochus IV avaient des boucliers de bronze argentés; l'infanterie légère était armée d'un bouclier en bois, d'une lance et d'une épée. Il y avait des troupes spéciales: archers, frondeurs et soldats armés de javalots, des régiments de cavalerie et des chars.

un peu souple, en pouvant désigner soit un corps d'armée, soit une unité de ce corps.

Ligne 5. Pour גריל cf. Dt. xxii 12, et surtout 1 Rois vii 17; dans la traduction שפה a été compris comme accusatif de relation. Le premier mot de l'expression צורת מחברת signifie „forme”, et en hébreu postbiblique כלי צורה signifie un vase ou autre chose, orné à la surface de figures; c'est le sens que le mot צורת semble avoir ici, tandis que מחברת (= joint) désigne ici, à ce qu'il semble, les choses (= les métaux, voir la suite) jointes. Le mot ממוזים ne se rencontre pas ailleurs; on peut le considérer comme forme verbale dénomminative de מוזה = montant (d'une porte), mot d'origine non-hébraïque, et dont l'idée principale semble avoir été celle d'un bord qui fait saillie. On le dérive généralement du mot accadien *manzāzu*, de *naṣṣāzu* = *sich stellen, treten vor* (BEZOLD). Dans les Septante il est une fois traduit par πρόθυρον (Ez. xlii 2), une autre fois par στοά (1 Rois vi 31, resp. 33), donc quelque chose qui fait saillie. Il n'est pas clair comment il faut lire les derniers six mots. Il semble bien que les deux premiers sont à l'état construit par rapport à ce qui suit, mais alors on se demande ce qu'il faut penser du dernier mot, car „artisan d'or, d'argent et de bronze en saillie” semble dénué de sens. Il est probable que l'auteur ne s'est pas intéressé à ces minuties grammaticales, son idée générale étant claire, bien que la construction de l'incise soit un peu maladroite; le cas n'est pas le seul dans les textes de Qumrân.

Ligne 6. Le mot אבדני, revenant dans la ligne 9 sous la forme de בדני est un *hapax*, difficile à traduire. Les deux fois il est suivi du même mot ריקמה, qui est précédé dans des contextes qui semblent tout à fait pareils par צורת (v 14; vii 11), ce qui donne au moins le droit de soupçonner que le sens n'en est pas trop divers. Dans le *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes* de R. Dozy, Tome 1, Leyde 1881, p. 58, il est dit que le mot arabe *badanun* peut désigner une sorte d'ornement que les femmes portaient sur la poitrine; on ne peut affirmer que בדני - אבדני est le même mot, mais le sens d'ornement va très bien.

Lignes 7-9. Le mot כידן se retrouve assez souvent dans l'Ancien Testament, et y est supposé avoir le sens de „javelot”, bien que les lexiques hésitent. Dans la Règle c'est clairement l'épée que portent les soldats¹), car la description qui en est faite ne permet pas d'autre sens. La סנר de la lance doit être la manche de la pointe de fer par laquelle cette pointe est attachée au fût. Cette manche se continuait dans la flèche comme une sorte d'épaississement se terminant en pointe, appelé (comme parfois toute la flèche) *šibbōlet* (= épi); dans le *Manuel d'archéologie biblique* de A.-G. BARROIS, Tome I, 1939, p. 386, on peut en voir des exemples, dont un porte même la figure d'un épi dessinée sur l'épaississement. La manche était décorée de trois anneaux, appelés צמידים, d'une certaine épaisseur (appelée de nouveau *šibbōlet*, épi, ligne 9). Les anneaux sont מפותחים (= gravés? cf. Ex. xxxix 6); ils semblent en outre être composés ou décorés de plusieurs métaux précieux et font penser au travail tressé autour des boucliers.

¹) Ainsi aussi Y. YADIN, dans *PEQ* LXXXVI 1955, p. 58: „a certain type of sword”.

Le travail tressé se trouve des deux côtés de chaque anneau, tout autour; au milieu, également tout autour, il y a un épaississement qui porte des pierres précieuses de plusieurs couleurs. „Cannelée” est la traduction tentative de **מחורץ** (ligne 9).

Ligne 10. Le mot **שפור** est le participe passé d'une racine qui ne se trouve pas dans l'A.T. et à laquelle JASTROW donne le sens de „to pierce, to point”; il signifie ici „pointu”. Le mot **אל** signifie „vers”, „dans la direction de”; que cela en est bien le sens, ressort de l'usage du même mot dans la ligne 12, où une autre interprétation ne semble guère possible.

Ligne 12. De chaque côté de l'épée il y a des **ספות ישר אל הראש**. Pour le mot obscur **ספות** je n'ai trouvé d'autre sens que celui de „rainures”; normalement il signifie „bassin” (Ex. xii 22; etc.). Tant sur les épées modernes que sur les épées anciennes on voit des rainures pour faire écouler le sang. Lire: *sippôt jōšer* = des rainures droites.

Lignes 13-14. Le pouce n'est pas une mesure qu'on trouve souvent. S. KRAUSS ne la mentionne même pas dans sa *Talmudische Archäologie* (cf. Vol. II, 1911, p. 389); on le retrouve comme mesure dans le traité *Sopberim* II 4¹) et il doit être un peu plus large qu'un doigt (1 doigt = 1,85 cm). L'épée était longue d'une coudée et demie, soit de neuf **טפחים** (= largeurs de main); une partie longue de cinq **טפחים** entraînait dans le fourreau tandis que le reste en sortait. — L'emploi de la lance, d'une courte épée ou dague et d'un bouclier, réunis comme armement d'un soldat, était déjà connu en Orient au temps de Ramsès III, cf. I. BENZINGER, *Hebräische Archäologie* 1927³, p. 302, et n'a donc rien de nouveau ou de spécial. Le mot **מרוגלת** (ligne 13) est difficile à traduire exactement; il faut en deviner le sens approximatif.

Ligne 16. Les sept „lignes” dont il est question, semblent être chacune de 1000 hommes, comme il ressort d'une comparaison du texte avec vi 8 ss. (voir les notes).

Ligne 17. Les trente coudées indiquent peut-être une distance, on ne sait pas laquelle. Les lignes 16-18 sont fort abîmées, impossible de les reconstruire. Puisque vi 1 ss. en semblent être la suite, on dirait que les premières opérations militaires y sont décrites.

Col. vi 1-6. Le texte décrit certaines opérations qui ouvrent le combat. Trois unités doivent entrer en action, mais il n'est pas dit ce que toutes doivent faire. L'interprétation la plus probable semble être que *chacune* lance sept javelots, ceux de la deuxième unité étant appelés le “deuxième projectile”, ceux de la troisième le “troisième javelot”. Le lancement doit rendre la ligne ennemie mûre pour l'attaque. Après le lancement, les trois unités se retirent pour faire place aux dernières. Parce qu'elles sont destinées pour le corps à corps, elles sont armées de boucliers. Le sens de **שלט** (ligne 2, fin), dont les lexiques ne savent que faire

¹) Voir la traduction de ce traité par H. BARDTKE, dans *Wissenschaftliche Zschr. der K. Marx-Universität, Leipzig*. 3 Jahrg. 1953/54, *Gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaft. Reihe* Heft 1, p. 17.

(voir cependant ZORELL, *Lexicon Hebraicum et Aramaicum*, où שלט est rapproché du mot arabe *šiltā* = *sagitta tenuis, oblonga*) est apparemment le même que celui de רוק.

Lignes 8-17. Une nouvelle arme entre en action, celle des פרשים = cavaliers. À côté d'eux il y avait des רכב, ce qui est probablement un nom pour les chevaux ¹⁾, non pour les chars. En Orient le char était de plus en plus tombé en désuétude mais non abandonné; les armées séleucides avaient des chars à faux, et ils sont encore mentionnés dans 1 Macc. viii 6; 2 Macc. xiii 2. Le char ayant été remplacé le plus souvent par le cheval, on peut penser que dans le langage militaire celui-ci a reçu le nom de רכב; en syriaque *reḵbtā* peut signifier „cheval”. Lignes 11 (fin) - 12 on lit: ... סוסים זכרים ... כול הרכב ... dont la traduction la plus naturelle semble être: „Tous les chevaux ... (seront) des chevaux masculins ...”. On pourrait, à la rigueur, traduire les mots cités d'après 2 Rois vii 14, où שני רכב = deux chars à chevaux, et traduire: „Tous les chars ... auront des chevaux masculins ...” etc., ce qui serait parfaitement admissible du point de vue grammatical. Mais le texte parle des *rekeb* qui partent au combat avec les hommes de l'infanterie et décrit seulement, et longuement, les chevaux. Ligne 14 il est question des cavaliers הסרך; col. vii 1 reviennent les אנשי הסרך et il est dit d'eux qu'ils doivent être âgés de 40-50 ans, tandis que les *sôr-kê ha-maḥ'nôt* (l.c.) doivent avoir l'âge de 50 à 60. Les *šôḥrîm* doivent avoir le même âge que les *anšê ha-serek*, 40 à 50 ans. Il s'ensuit que les hommes du *serek* ne sont pas les guerriers ordinaires, ni les plus hautes autorités (dans Dan. vi 3-5, au contraire, les *sār-kîn* sont les hauts ministres du roi). Dans la règle on peut, peut-être, voir en eux les commandants de 10, 50 et 100. De ces commandants, il y en a 130 par unité de 1000 hommes; or il est dit qu'il y en a 6500 par tribu (vi 11), ce qui porterait le nombre des guerriers de chaque tribu à 50 000 et de tout le peuple à 600 000, d'accord avec Num. i 46. Cet accord pourrait être tout à fait accidentel, mais le fait que l'auteur dispose ses troupes et arrange son camp d'après la description sacerdotale de Num. ii peut être considéré comme une confirmation.

Il est dit en outre que les „hommes des lignes” auront à leur disposition 1400 *rekeb*, 50 par ligne (lignes 10/11). Selon ce calcul il doit y avoir 28 lignes, soit 4×7 . Tout cela s'explique au mieux si les troupes sont disposés dans un carré, comme dans Num. ii. Cette armée ne comprend pas tous les hommes capables de porter des armes, c'est la grande unité militaire qui opère séparément, et à côté d'elle il peut y avoir d'autres (cf. vii 7).

Ainsi tous les chiffres des lignes 7-17 ont été expliqués, sauf un seul. Il est dit, en effet, qu'il y a en tout 4600 cavaliers (ligne 10), qui accompagnent l'infanterie au combat et qui se placent à tous les côtés du camp. Selon notre calcul il aurait dû y en avoir $4 \times 1400 = 5600$, donc 1000 en plus. La divergence pourrait être expliquée de plusieurs façons: 1. 4600 est une faute du copiste, comme „dizaines” dans iv 3 et une autre dans vii 1

¹⁾ Interprétation proposée la première fois par M. DUPONT-SOMMER, à Strasbourg en mai 1955.

2. l'auteur a pensé à un total de $1400 + 4600 = 6000$ chevaux (ligne 10 = Col. ix 5) = un cheval sur cent hommes. La deuxième solution semble être préférable à la première à cause du texte très explicite de ix 5 où il est question d'un total de 6000 cavaliers; l'auteur de la Règle a pu penser que le côté du camp le moins exposé à l'ennemi n'aura besoin que d'un nombre réduit de cavaliers.

A lire col. v 3 ss. on pourrait encore penser que les 1000 hommes d'une *ma^arākāh* étaient disposés en lignes d'environ 143 hommes, l'une derrière l'autre. Mais s'il y a sept *ma^arākôt* de cette espèce, la profondeur de la ligne devient très grande, trop grande à ce qu'il semble. On est donc amené à supposer que la מערכה des lignes 8-9 est composée de sept rangs de 1000 hommes, et que chaque rang pouvait aussi être considéré comme une מערכה.

Ligne 10. Lacune: ע[ברי].

Ligne 12. תכון est distinct de תיכון (vii 9) et signifie „juste mesure”, „exactitude” (cf. DSD vi 10; vii 21; ix 2).

Ligne 15. Dernière lacune: שמונה אמות.

Ligne 16. La première lettre de la deuxième lacune semble être un *samek* ce qui rend plusieurs lectures possibles.

Col. vii. lignes 1-7. Age des fonctionnaires militaires et de ceux qui participent au combat. D'après Num. i 3 etc. l'âge militaire est de 20 ans; les lévites peuvent exercer leur ministère depuis l'âge de 30 jusqu'à 50 ans (Num. iv 3, etc.). Num. viii 24 leur permet de commencer dès qu'ils auront 25 ans, et Num. viii 26 leur concède de rendre encore quelques services après l'âge de 50. Dans 1 Chron. xxiii 27 l'âge de l'entrée en service des lévites est même réduite à 20 ans. Pour les prêtres rien n'est statué. On a l'impression que pour l'auteur de la Règle l'âge (lévitique) de 30-50 est idéale. Les „hommes du cadre”, donc les commandants de 10, 50, 100 (si notre interprétation est juste, cf. vi 8 ss., notes) doivent être âgés de 40 à 50 ans. Ceux qui commandent dans les camps, dont la charge est plus haute(?) et moins dangereuse, peuvent être âgés de 50-60 ans¹⁾.

Ligne 1. Le scribe avait d'abord écrit que les *sôr^akê* des camps doivent avoir l'âge de 40-50 ans, mais ceci a été corrigé, par lui-même ou par un autre, en 50-60. Puisqu'une différence est faite entre les *anšê ba-serek* et les *sôr^akê ba-mah^anôt*, il semble bien que la correction soit exacte.

Ligne 5. Pour „qui vont volontiers au combat”, ce qui veut rendre מלחמה אנשי נדבת, cf. Ps. cx 3; dans DSD i 11, etc. les membres de la communauté sont appelés נדבים.

Ligne 6. L'avant-dernier mot doit être lu *m^arewah* (Gen. xxxii 17; cf. Esth. iv 14), et non *m^arū^ah*; il s'agit de la distance entre les divers camps.

Ligne 7. Pour la dernière prescription, cf. Dt. xxiii 13-15.

Lignes 9-18. Commencement du combat, rôle des prêtres.

¹⁾ Selon CDC (= documents de Damas, édités par S. SCHECHTER) les juges de la communauté doivent avoir l'âge de 25-60 (CDC x 6-8). Au-dessus de cet âge on est censé être incapable de bien remplir cet office (ibid., x 8-10), ce qui est en accord tacite avec Lév. xxvii 1-7.

Ligne 10. Pour les termes employés, cf. Ex. xxvi 1; xxviii 4; etc.

Ligne 11. On a vu, à propos de v 5, que צורה peut avoir le sens d'ornementation; ici ce doit être de la broderie en figures. פרי est le pluriel construit de פאר = turban, écrit défectivement.

Lignes 11/12. Les prêtres ne peuvent pas porter en guerre les mêmes vêtements officiels qu'au temple, bien qu'ils puissent avoir la même forme. La haute sainteté des vêtements dont on se servait durant le ministère sacré (ils venaient en contact avec les choses saintes) exigeait qu'on ne le portait qu'au sanctuaire (cf. Ex. xxviii 43; Ez. xlii 14; xlv 19). Et en temps de guerre les vêtements des prêtres risquaient aussi à devenir souillés par le contact de choses impures ou de personnes impures, malgré la défense aux prêtres de prendre part au combat (ix 7-9).

Ligne 13. Selon Num. x 2-10 on pouvait faire des signaux différents avec les trompettes: donner de coups courts (תקע), faire retentir un son prolongé (הריע), se servir d'une seule trompette ou de deux à la fois, répéter plusieurs fois le même son. Dans la Règle les signaux sont plus nombreux et plus compliqués, comme aussi les trompettes. Les noms de ces dernières ne sont pas tous les mêmes que dans iii 1-11.

Ligne 14. Les lévites portent des שופרות = trompes, instruments moins sacrés, souvent mentionnés dans l'Ancien Testament, surtout dans les anciens textes.

Ligne 15. Lacune: המ[קרא . . . מ]לחמה. Le mot על est difficile à expliquer; cf. v 3.

Ligne 16. Les „lévites intendants” sont des intendants qui appartiennent à la classe des lévites¹⁾; ils sont chargés de l'administration, etc.

Ligne 17. Premier mot incomplet הס[רך]?

Ligne 18. Premiers mots: [ועמ]דר בין שתי המערכות. Dernier mot: המל[חמה].

Col. viii 1-17. Le texte de cette colonne a déjà été publié en 1948, voir l'introduction de cet article. Parmi ceux qui l'ont traduite il faut encore nommer G. MOLIN, *Die Söhne des Lichtes*, 1954, pp. 40-42.

Dans ce passage on voit entrer en action des frondeurs, qu'on n'a pas encore rencontrés dans la partie conservée du texte précédent. Il y en avait dans les armées séleucides, cf. 1 Macc. ix 11, où il est dit que des frondeurs et des archers marchaient en tête de l'armée syrienne. Dans la Règle ils sont suivis de trois unités, bataillons (*d'gālīm*) d'infanterie, qui ont à leurs flancs des unités de cavaliers, selon une coutume déjà ancienne au temps de l'auteur et qu'on retrouve dans les armées hellénistiques et romaines. On fait une alarme de guerre aussi forte que possible, chacun lance sept javalots de guerre (ou des flèches?) dans les rangs de l'ennemi . . . et on se retire pour donner place à d'autres.

Ligne 1. L'expression לנצח est traduite par TOURNAY par „pour diriger” par MOLIN „als Signal . . . zu leiten”; tous deux y voient donc un infinitif avec ל^e (cf. 1 Chron. xxiii 4). VERMÈS traduit: „Les trompettes sonneront

¹⁾ Pour le sens du mot *šōṭṣrīm* voir J. VAN DER PLOEG, *Les šōṭṣrīm d'Israël*, OTS X, 1954, pp. 185-196, et E. JUNGE, *Der Wiederaufbau des Heerwesens des Reiches Juda unter Josias*, BWANT IV 23, 1937, pp. 48-52.

jusqu'à ce que les frondeurs aient fini de lancer sept fois" (*o.c.*, p. 193), en donnant à *nešab* un sens de durée. On peut se demander si נצח ne soit pas devenu un substantif au sens de „signe”, mais autant que cela n'est pas prouvé, il sera mieux d'y voir un infinitif *piel*, au sens de „donner des signes”, „donner des indications”; dans le langage militaire c'est donc „donner un signal”.

Ligne 2. Les frondeurs, leur action finie, doivent prendre position à côté de la ligne qu'ils avaient probablement précédée, pour donner toute liberté d'attaque à d'autres troupes.

Ligne 4. Cf. col. vi 1! Le texte semble être une répétition de ce qui a déjà été dit, puisqu'il est de nouveau question de trois unités (*d'gālīm*) qui doivent lancer des *z'rāqōt*. Ici le texte est plus développé et il nous est dit que des cavaliers devaient se tenir aux deux flancs, à gauche et à droite.

Ligne 5. La Règle emploie plusieurs termes, probablement techniques et militaires, pour indiquer les différentes façons de faire retentir les trompettes; le sens de plusieurs de ces termes n'est pas très clair. L'expression ידרי סדר (*y'dē saddēr*) signifie „pour arranger”, selon un usage de l'hébreu postbiblique.

Ligne 6. Seulement maintenant les chefs vont à leurs troupes, peut-être les hauts chefs, qui avaient été convoqués pour un conseil de guerre. Les trois bataillons se mettent en position en trois rangées.

Ligne 7. Le mot מפשע est un substantif, inconnu de l'Ancien Testament.

Ligne 9. „Ceux qui tiennent les trompes” (עם השופרות) sont distincts des lévites (cf. aussi vii 14); il faut donc penser que la partie inférieure manquant de col. vii donnait à ce sujet des indications plus précises, ou bien qu'on a ici une nouvelle preuve du caractère composite du texte. D'après Jug. vii 16 les 300 hommes de Gédéon emmenaient tous des trompes en vue du stratagème que leur commandant avait inventé.

Ligne 15. A compléter ainsi: הלוים בחצוצרות ובשופרות.

Ligne 16. A compléter ainsi: מלחמה... ועם הטל השני יריעו להם.

Ligne 17. Fin de la lacune: ... ועמדן.

Col. ix 1-9. Dans ce passage est décrite la grande attaque de toute l'armée, lorsque les troupes en viennent aux mains dans une lutte de corps à corps. Le passage donne encore une fois le nombre des participants au combat (lignes 4 ss.): six bataillons et le bataillon qui a ouvert le combat, soit sept bataillons (דגלים), tous ensemble sept lignes (מערכות). Les 28000 fantassins ne sont probablement pas les „sept lignes”, bien que le texte semble le dire, mais tout le corps de l'armée, soit 4×7 lignes, en accord avec les calculs précédents. Ou faut-il corriger le texte de la ligne 4 en transposant כולם après מערכות? La caractéristique incomplète du rouleau exhorte à la prudence dans l'interprétation du texte et plus encore dans sa „correction”.

Ligne 3. „Vers eux” = vers les prêtres.

Ligne 4. Dans v 3 il avait été question d'une seule „ligne de front”; le pluriel qui est employé ici prouve qu'il y en a plusieurs. Le reste du texte n'est pas facile à comprendre comme il a été dit ci-dessus. הדגל המתקרב est le bataillon qui prend part (à l'instant) au combat.

Ligne 6. Le mot מדרוף est écrit ailleurs מרדף; au seul endroit où on

trouve le mot dans l'Ancien Testament les masorètes l'ont vocalisé *murḏāf* (Is. xiv 6). Lacune: [והחל] (cf. Gen. xiv 15). L'armée qui poursuit l'ennemi fuyant se divise en groupes, puisque l'ennemi a fait la même chose.

Ligne 7. C'est la seule fois, dans le texte conservé du moins, qu'il est dit que les cavaliers prennent activement part au combat (dans viii 4, 5 leur seule présence est attestée); ils repoussent les flancs de la ligne ennemie (pour éviter l'encercllement).

Ligne 8. Lacune: [ולין]. Le texte suppose que chaque prêtre est oint, consacré; c'est important, car la Loi ne parle que de l'onction des premiers prêtres dans le désert (Ex. xxix 1 ss.).

Lignes 10-16. L'auteur traite d'une nouvelle façon de disposer les troupes, lorsque le terrain ne se prête pas à la disposition qu'il vient de décrire. Le texte est abîmé, assez difficile à restaurer, et il contient certaines expressions techniques difficiles à comprendre. On a l'impression que l'auteur prévoit le cas que les Fils de lumière doivent établir dans une région montagneuse une ligne de défense (d'où partira l'attaque), qui comprend un certain nombre de tours de défense, en saillie de la ligne. Trois côtés des tours donnent sur l'ennemi et chaque tour a deux portes (pour faire des sorties?).

Ligne 10. Lacune: על [רכסים והר במלחמת] גליל; pour le premier mot complété (dont les restes de la première lettre sont encore visibles) cf. Is. xl 4. Pour *kēf* = rocher cf. Jér. iv 29; Job xxx 6.

Ligne 11. La combinaison קשת ומגדלות est étonnante s'il faut la traduire par „arc et tours”; le copiste a-t-il mal transcrit un mot de la racine קשה = être dur (donc peut-être קשות)? On pourrait alors penser à un terrain „dur” = difficile. L'expression על דרוך מעט est difficile à traduire; notre traduction n'est qu'une tentative de le faire. Le sens de ראשים n'est pas non plus clair; ce peuvent être des divisions d'armée qui sortent pour parcourir le pays (cf. Jug. vii 16, 20; ix 34; 1 Sam. xi 11). Les „ailes” peuvent être des unités de cavalerie. Pouvait-on se servir de celle-ci dans le terrain en question? On ne saurait le dire puisqu'on ne sait au juste de quel terrain il s'agit; dans l'antiquité on a bien vu des rois araméens avec leurs chars et leurs chevaux faire le siège de Samarie (1 Rois xx 1 ss.).

Ligne 12. Les boucliers des tours sont plus longs que celle de l'infanterie ordinaire (cf. col. v 6), et les lances également (cf. col. v 7). Lacune: [ורמחיהם אורך].

Ligne 13. Lacune: [כ.ולם יסבו].

Ligne 14. Lacune: [אחד לימין ואחד]. On ne sait pas où sont placées les deux portes; à gauche et à droite? Le fait qu'il y en a deux prouve qu'on se servait du moins d'une d'elles pour faire des sorties.

Lignes 14/15. Sur chaque bouclier est écrit le nom d'un de quatre grands archanges; pour le „prince” Michel, cf. Dan. x 13, 21; xii 1. Le nom Sariël se retrouve dans un fragment grec d'Hénoch xx 6 (cf. R. H. CHARLES, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, vol. II, 1913, p. 201. Cf. aussi STRACK-BILLERBECK, *Kommentar* ... etc., III, pp. 805-807. Sariël est un des plus saints des sept archanges, parmi lesquels on compte encore, en dehors des plus connus, Uriel, Re'ûel (Raguel), Remiel. Selon Hén. xl 9-10 les quatre anges principaux s'appellent Michel, Raphaël, Gabriël, Phanuël. Michel

est le grand défenseur du peuple Juif (cf. Dan. xii 1); il n'y a donc pas de quoi s'étonner si son nom et ceux d'autres archanges figurent sur des armes et des tours de défense.

Ligne 17. Cette ligne, dont il reste presque rien, est le commencement d'un nouveau passage. La première lettre, dont un petit reste est encore visible, semble avoir été un *šade*; on peut lire le commencement de la phrase ainsi . . . **[צבא] לארב[ע מערכות]**. A la fin de la lacune, devant **ורב**, on peut encore lire un *alef* et ainsi on obtient le mot **אורב**, cf. Jér. ix 7.

Col. x 1-18. Cette colonne contient le texte d'allocutions devant le combat. La dernière est plutôt une hymne en style élevé et poétique (parallélisme des membres), mais non aussi rythmique que le texte de la plupart des psaumes de l'Ancien Testament.

Ligne 1. Lacune: **ול[הש]מר**. „Toute chose honteuse et mauvaise”, cf. Dt. xxiii 15; xxiv 1. Pour „Tu es au milieu de nous”, cf. Ex. xvii 7; xxxiv 9; 1 Sam. iv 3; Jér. xiv 9; Mich. iii 11. L'expression **לשול** peut être un infinitif de *šalal*, mais il semble préférable d'y voir un infinitif de *našal* avec *l*^o et avec assimilation du premier *nun*; en hébreu mišnique on trouve les mêmes formes, mais écrites avec un *yod* derrière le *lamed*, cf. M.H. SEGAL, *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*, 1927, p. 78. Pour *našal*, cf. Dt. vii 1, 22.

Lignes 2-4. La citation est empruntée à Dt. xx 2-4; elle présente quelques légères variantes avec le texte masorétique dont il est difficile à dire s'ils sont le résultat d'une autre tradition textuelle, ou d'une citation de mémoire.

Ligne 4. Lacune: **ואל תח[פוז]ואל**.

Ligne 5. Le texte rappelle Dt. xx 5 ss.

Ligne 6. Lacune: **ד[בב]ה**.

Ligne 7-8. La citation est empruntée à Num. x 9; elle est conforme au texte masorétique, sauf quelques variantes de graphie, et deux variantes réelles. La première, **תבוא** au lieu de **תבואו** (M), a quelque importance puisque le texte masorétique ne semble pas être en règle.

Ligne 7. Lacune: **הריעו[תמה]**.

Ligne 9. Le troisième et le quatrième mot sont séparés par un trait irrégulier de 9 mm, qui veut peut-être indiquer qu'il n'y aurait pas dû y avoir de lacune; cf. la note à propos de la lacune de i 10.

Ligne 10. L'expression „un peuple de saints dans l'Alliance” combine des mots trouvés dans Dan. viii 24; xi 30; etc. Lacune: **[. . . אל]**. Le texte est plein de reminiscences bibliques, ici et ailleurs, qui ne seront pas toutes mentionnées ici.

Ligne 11. „Qui voient les saints anges” est une allusion aux apparitions d'anges mentionnés dans l'Ancien Testament; cf. Jos. v 13, et surtout 2 Macc. ii 21; iii 25 ss.; x 29; xi 8. La „Voix majestueuse” est une allusion à Ex. xx 19; cf. Dt. v 4 ss. Pour „qui entendent des choses profondes”, cf. Job xii 22; pour „Qui étend...” cf. Job xxxvi 30; Ps. cv 39. Lacune: **[אתה האל הקדוש]**?

Ligne 12. L'„empire des saints” doit être le ciel. Lacune: **[כב[וד מפרש]**, restauration douteuse, puisque l'espace disponible est un peu plus large. Quant à l'expression **חוקי מפלפיה** on pourrait se demander si **חוקי** n'est pas un participe actif de **חקה** (dénominateur de **חוק**) = faire des incisions (1 Rois vi 35; Job xiii 27); le deuxième mot, **מפלג**, ne se retrouve pas dans

Ancien Testament, mais bien dans les *Hôdāyôt*, éd. SUKENIK 1954, Pl. III XXXVII), ligne 30 (= *Meg. Genūzôt* II, Ps. *Gimel*, 42), au sens de „cours d'eau”, „canaux”. Dans le désert, p. ex. dans la ‘Arabah au sud de la Mer Morte, on trouve de nombreux wadis sèches creusés par des averses d'hiver; il semble que l'auteur y fasse allusion.

Ligne 13. Lacune: פְּרִיָּם לְמִנִּיָּה (cf. DELCOR); „jaillissement” = מִבְּקַע.

Ligne 14. Lacune: וְתוֹלְדוֹת זָרָעוֹ; „division” est traduction de מִפְּרֵד, un des multiples substantifs avec mem comme préformante qu'on rencontre dans ce texte et qu'on ne retrouve pas dans l'Ancien Testament. — La mention de l'oeuvre de la création appartient au style authentique des hymnes.

Col. xi. Le texte continue dans le même style hymnique.

Ligne 1. L'auteur s'imagine que Dieu a „écrasé” les corps de ses ennemis; ce verbe s'emploie dans l'Ancien Testament de préférence de l'écrasement d'enfants dans la guerre, cf. 2 Rois viii 12; Is. xiii 16; Os. xiv 1; Nah. iii 10; d'une mère d'enfants Os. x 14; d'arcs Is. xiii 18. L'emploi du verbe pour désigner l'écrasement d'ennemis puissants a donc une saveur spéciale. Pour אֵין קוֹבֵר cf. Ps. lxxix 3; 2 Rois ix 10. Cf. aussi 1 Sam. xvii 46.

Ligne 2. Cf. 1 Sam. xvii 47.

Ligne 3. Lacune: הַכְנִיעַת; il n'y a pas de place pour un *ב* final.

Ligne 5. Lacune: כְּאֶשֶׁר.

Lignes 6-7. Citation de la prophétie de Biléam, Num. xxiv 17-19, non textuelle, mais assez libre quant à l'ordre des versets originels. „Oints” (ligne 7) est pris dans le sens très général de tous ceux qui ont reçu une onction (prophètes, prêtres, rois), et qui ont prédit l'avenir. Il va de soi que l'auteur interprète les paroles des prophètes à sa façon, tout comme c'est fait dans le *pešer* d'Habacuc et dans les restes des autres *p'sārīm*.

Ligne 8. Les תְּעוּדוֹת sont ici les déclarations, révélations solennelles de Dieu, faites aux prophètes, qui les ont „vues”. Dans la révélation prophétique l'élément optique et l'élément acoustique vont de pair (cf. Am. i 1; Is. ii 1; Mich. i 1; Is. xiii 1; Hab. i 1); dans la perception prophétique „voir” et „entendre” sont souvent confondus. Lacune: Pour „les guerres de tes mains”, cf. Num. xxi 14; 1 Sam. xviii 17; xxv 28; Sir. xlv 3. „Pour être glorifié” לְהַכְבֵּד; le texte originel avait לְהִלָּחֵם; un scribe a mis des points en dessus et dans les dernières trois lettres du mot (= „deleatur”) et a écrit כִּבְד en dessus.

Ligne 8/9. Pour les „sept peuples vains” cf. Dt. vii 1 (Jos. xxiv 11); dans les autres textes pareils de l'Ancien Testament ne sont énumérés que six peuples. „Les pauvres que Tu sauves” = אֲבִינֵי פְדוּתָהָּ; les membres du groupe se donnaient volontiers le nom d'*ebjônīm*, mot qui a eu pour eux un sens quasi-religieux: pour montrer sa force Dieu aide de préférence les pauvres, les indigents; mais aussi: en face du Dieu tout-puissant tout homme doit confesser qu'il est un pauvre indigent. Lacune: בְּכֹיֵן. „Porte d'espérance”, cf. Os. ii 17. Bien que l'auteur parle du passé, il pense aussi au présent et au futur; certains événements du passé sont pour lui des faits typiques: Dieu sauve ses élus dans le temps présent et dans l'avenir, de la même façon qu'il a fait dans le passé.

Ligne 10. „Comme une torche de feu dans la paille”, cf. Zach. xii 6.

Ligne 11. Lacune: **השמן[דתם ב]עד**; pour le sens que **בעד** est supposé avoir ici, cf. Joël ii 8. La chute des Kitti'im est considérée comme l'accomplissement d'une prédiction de la chute d'Assour, d'après Is. xxxi 8, cité par l'auteur. Cette citation se comprend au mieux si pour l'auteur *Kitti'im* est un autre nom pour *Assour*, si non toujours, du moins parfois.

Ligne 13. Un nouveau passage commence: Dieu ne livrera pas seulement les Syriens aux mains des gens de Qumrân, l'Israël fidèle, mais tous les pays de la terre, selon ce qui avait été décrit dans col. i-ii. Lacune: **[אויב]**.

Ligne 14. Lacune: **[ב]רא[ש א]שמתם**; le *waw* devant **להצדיק**, douteux d'après la transcription de SUKENIK, est clairement visible. Pour l'expression **השיב בראש**, cf. Jug. ix 57; 1 Sam. xxv 39; 1 Rois ii 44; Joël iv 7.

Ligne 15. La première partie de la ligne a entièrement disparu. Dernière partie: **ש[א]ר ה[עמ]ים לדעתם**.

16. Premier mot visible: **הנקהלים עליכה**. . . Fin (visible): **הנקהלים עליכה**. Pour Gog, cf. Ez. xxxviii-xxxix. Il est un ennemi du nord; aidé de nombreux peuples il attaque l'Israël restauré et vivant en paix. Dieu le détruit en lui envoyant la peste et en laissant pluire sur lui de l'eau, du feu, du soufre, de la grêle (Ez. xxxviii 22). Il est fort malheureux que le texte de la Règle a tellement souffert à cet endroit, car on peut se demander si Gog et ses alliés ne représentent pas pour l'auteur de la Règle les ennemis combattus dans la guerre de quarante ans, guerre précédée par une période de paix qui suivra la défaite des Syriens. Mais il se peut aussi que Gog et les siens sont pour l'auteur de la Règle l'image du roi syrien et de ses alliés (respectivement ses mercenaires étrangers).

Ligne 16. Cf. Ez. xxxviii 22.

Ligne 18. Les maigres restes sont difficiles à interpréter.

Col. xii. ligne 1. Première lacune: **[לכ]ה**. La deuxième lacune peut être complétée de plusieurs façons, p. ex. **לה[ודות לשמ]כה**. Les „élus” du peuple peuvent être tous les Israélites (Ps. cv 43; cvi 5; 1 Chron. xvi 13), ou les membres d'un groupe spécial (Is. lxxv 9, 15). Dans Is. xliii 20; xlv 4 Israël est appelé l'élus de Jahvé. Pour „peuple saint” cf. Dan. xii 7.

Ligne 2. Première lacune: **[ב]חיים וספ[ר]**; deuxième: **ומספר צדיקים**. Pour l'idée du livre céleste qui contient des noms on peut voir e.a. J. BONSIRVEN, *Le Judaïsme Palestinien* I, 1935, p. 190; on y est renvoyé à Hen. xlvii 3; xciii 2; Test. Lev. Aram. 59, 60. Cf. aussi Ex. xxxii 32; Ps. lxix 29; Dan. xii 1 et la littérature mentionnée par R. H. CHARLES, *The Book of Enoch* 1893, p. 132.

Ligne 3. Première lacune: **ברכת[ה הטובה]** (cf. Prov. xxiv 25: *birkat šôb*). Deuxième lacune: tout le mot manque, sauf un trait vertical, reste du commencement de la première lettre. Le mot **חרתה**, au milieu de la ligne doit signifier (selon le contexte) „Tu as gravé”, cf. **חרר** I (Ges. *Wb.*) = percer, perforer; en arabe *harara* signifie e.a. „écrire avec exactitude”.

Ligne 4. Première lacune: **צ[ב]אות ב[ח]יריכה**; pour compléter la deuxième on peut choisir **[שמתה]**, ou un mot pareil.

Ligne 5. Première lacune: **[ועשיתם נר]קמי**; deuxième lacune: **[נוצחיים]**.

Lignes 7-16. Le texte célèbre en style poétique la gloire de Dieu qui est avec les armées d'Israël et leur procure la victoire.

Ligne 7. Lacune: [נִירָא]

Ligne 8. Lacune: [גְּבוּרִים].

Ligne 9. Lacune: וּפְרָשִׁינָו [כְּעֻנִים]. Pour l'image employée, cf. Jér. iv 13. Pour עֲבִי טַל cf. Is. xviii 4, et pour l'idée que les guerriers tombent sur leurs ennemis comme la rosée, cf. 2 Sam. xvii 12.

Ligne 10. Pour la deuxième partie de cette ligne, cf. Jug. v 12.

Ligne 11. Pour בְּמוֹתֵי, cf. Dt. xxxii 13.

Ligne 14. Lacune: [שַׁעֲרֵי]. Le texte contient des citations partielles d'Is. lx 10, 11, 14.

Ligne 15. Première lacune: [רְגִלֶּיךָ יִלְחָכוּ בְנוֹת], cf. Is. xlix 23. Pour וְרִידֶיךָ cf. Targ. II Esth. vi 10 (dans l'édition de LAGARDE, *Hagiographa Chaldaica*, 1873, p. 259, ligne 11), où le mot fait partie d'une série de termes qui désignent des ornements et des vêtements de parure. Deuxième lacune: [בְּחֵיל]?

Col. xiii 1-6. Deux textes: une bénédiction et une malédiction, séparées par la fin ouverte d'une ligne.

Ligne 1. Pour עֹמְדִם, cf. Dan. x 11.

Ligne 2. Première lacune: [בְּלִי עַל]; deuxième: [כִּים].

Ligne 3. Lacune: [מִשְׁרָתֵי]. Les „serviteurs” sont en premier lieu les anges.

Ligne 4. „Dans son dessein hostile” = בְּמַחֲשַׁבַּת מִשְׁטָמָה; pour cette expression, cf. Os. ix 7; Jub. x 8; DSD iii 23. Le dualisme modéré du *Manuel de discipline* est aussi celui de la Règle.

Ligne 6. Lacune: [עֹלָמִים].

Lignes 7-16. Nouvelle prière hymnique, dont le style est un peu moins poétique que celui des hymnes précédentes.

Ligne 7. Première lacune: [וְאֵתָה]; deuxième: [וְגִרְלָתָהּ].

Ligne 8. Lacune: [אֲמֹנֶתָהּ]. Le mot מַחִיָּה peut être pris comme un substantif (*mihjāh* = ce qui entretient la vie, cf. Gen. xlv 5; Sir. xxxviii 14; Esdr. ix 8), ou comme participe *hifil* (*piel* serait également possible, mais seul le *hifil* est employé dans l'Ancien Testament avec *h*, cf. Gen. xlv 7, etc.), comme dans notre traduction. Le substantif בְּרִית semble signifier „le peuple de l'alliance”, cf. col. xiv 4; Dan. xi 22, 28 (voir J. A. MONTGOMERY, *Daniel*, ICC, 1927, p. 451; en syriaque le mot *q'yāmā* désigne souvent „ceux qui ont conclu une alliance”, comme p. ex. le clergé, les moines). Il faut cependant remarquer qu'en hébreu „alliance” ou „peuple de l'alliance” ne constitue pas un dilemme strict, car *brît* peut signifier les deux choses à la fois, ce qui signifie dans ce texte: Dieu, qui entretient le peuple de l'Alliance qui lui est fidèle, tient aussi l'Alliance.

Ligne 9. Première lacune [וְלִסְפָּר]; deuxième: [אֵתָהּ וְהֵרַב יִתְנוּ]. On voudrait lire [וְעֵשׂ יִתְנוּ], mais ceci ne semble pas juste, puisqu'on voit encore sur la planche des restes d'un petit trait qui pourrait être le trait gauche supérieur d'un *bet*, *dalet* ou *resh*, mais non d'un *sin*.

Ligne 10. Cf. DSD iii 13ss. Le prince est sans doute l'archange Michel, cf. Dan. xii 1. Lacune: [וּבְיִשְׁתָּנוּ וְלֵהֲחִיזֵק].

Ligne 11. L'auteur ne tombe dans le dualisme perse ou manichéen; pour

lui tout a été créé par Dieu, même le diable. On traduit souvent „Bélial” par „vaurien”, ce qui ne doit pas faire perdre de vue que partout où le mot est employé dans l’Ancien Testament il désigne des personnes, des êtres, qui veulent nuire et faire du mal; le nom est donc particulièrement bien choisi pour le chef des esprits de ténèbres, dans la conception qu’on s’en faisait dans la communauté de Qumrân. Lacune: רובחו[שך הפל]תו.

Ligne 12. Lacune: תשו[קתמה] (TOURNAY), cf. Gen. iii 16; iv 7. Le rôle des esprits de ténèbres est le même que dans le passage fameux de DSE col. iii 13 ss.

Ligne 13. Lacune: בע[זרתכה ובש]לומכה.

Ligne 14. Pour „pauvres” = אביונים, cf. xi 9. Première lacune: פוןעלכה; les restes du *alef* sont clairement visibles. Deuxième lacune: פל[א]ר[ב ונחשיר], cf. i 9.

Ligne 15. Le premier mot de la ligne est perdu; lire ce qui suit להכי[ר].

Ligne 16. Le sens général ou approximatif des premiers mots perdus ressort de ce qui suit; un dernier *lamed* est encore à identifier, et on pourrait donc lire: [להביא עם א]ל.

Col. xiv 1. Derniers mots d’un passage qui a probablement commencé col. xiii ligne 18.

Lignes 2-15. Morceau déjà publié par SUKENIK dans le premier volume de ses *Megillôt Genâzôt* (à l’exception des deux derniers mots = ligne 15). Pour des traductions, cf. TOURNAY, *RB* LXV 1949, p. 215; VERMÈS, *o.c.*, pp. 194-195, et d’autres.

Ligne 2. Selon Num. xix 16, ceux qui touchent un cadavre sont impurs pendant toute une semaine et doivent subir des purifications spéciales. Les vêtements des guerriers, aspergés du sang hautement impur des ennemis d’Israël, doivent être lavés; on attend jusqu’au matin puisqu’on n’a pas à se hâter.

Ligne 4. Pour „(le peuple de) son Alliance”, cf. xiii 8, et l’expression parallèle „le peuple qu’il a délivré” (ligne 5).

Ligne 5. Lacune: ל[יצאת מכל]לא. Le texte rappelle plusieurs endroits d’Isaïe, cf. xlii 7; xlviii 20; xlix 9.

Ligne 6. Lacune: בגבו[רותיכה ולהת]רפות.

Ligne 7. Lacune: יתח[סם].; le *samêk* est conservé en grande partie et la lecture en semble probable. Alors, dans la supposition que *sm* sont les dernières deux lettres d’une racine, on ne peut trouver d’autre en hébreu biblique que חסם = obturer, cf. Dt. xxv 4; Ez. xxxix 11; Sir. xlviii 17.

Ligne 8. Lacune: ?שא[רית עמכה ולעד נודה]. Pour l’expression „reste de ton peuple”, cf. Mich. vii 18; Jér. vi 9; xxxi 7, où on lit des expressions parallèles.

Ligne 9. Lacune: לשא[רית נחלתכה], cf. Mich. vii 18. Le „reste” du peuple habite un monde méchant qui est l’empire de Bélial. „Desseins secrets” est une traduction de *rāzē*, le *rāz* étant le décret secret d’un roi, qui sera exécuté lorsqu’il le trouvera bon. S. Paul ne l’entend pas autrement lorsqu’il parle du „mystère” de Dieu, révélé maintenant aux hommes, cf. Rom. xi 25; xvi 25; Eph. i 9-10; iii 9; Col. i 26. Une partie de la dernière lettre du dernier mot de la ligne a été effacée; à lire probablement הדיחו[ם].

Ligne 10. Première lacune: רוחי[מע]לו; les restes d’un *‘ayin* sont encore

visibles. Pour מעל cf. Job xxi 34; Sir. x 7. On pourrait aussi penser à געל *gō'al* = horreur, abomination, cf. Ez. xvi 5. Deuxième lacune: מ]מען קודשכה וממען ש].

Ligne 11. Quatrième mot: קומ]ה, cf. Ez. xxxi 3. Lacune: תגד]עתה לאין. Le texte fait mention de *gibbôrîm*, *qallîm* et *nikbādîm* et on peut se demander si ces termes, en particulier les deux derniers, n'ont pas un sens militaire spécial, en désignant l'infanterie „légère” et „lourde”. Dans l'armée romaine il y avait des *milites levis armaturae*, appelés parfois *leves*, et les *milites gravis armaturae*, appelés aussi *graves*. Les Grecs aimaient à parler des γυμνῆτες, γυμνοί, χιλοί et des ὀπλίται, mais déjà Xenophon a employé les adjectifs ἐλαφρός et βαρύς pour désigner des troupes légères et lourdes (cf. *Anab.* IV 2. 27 et *Cyrop.* V 3, 37; et LIDDELL & SCOTT, *Greek-English Lexicon*, Vol. I, 1940, *sub verbis*) et Platon a employé le deuxième adjectif pour les ὀπλίται (cf. *Leges* 833 b, et LIDDELL & SCOTT, *o.c.*). En hébreu l'adjectif *qal* signifie „léger” et „vite” (cf. Is. v 26; Jér. ii 23; etc.), les deux qualités étant souvent connexes; même le mot grec ἐλαφρός a été employé par un auteur grec qui a décrit la tactique militaire des Grecs et des Macédoniens (Asclepiodotus, disciple de Posidonius, cf. LIDDELL & SCOTT, *s.v.*) pour qualifier la cavalerie. Le mot hébreu *nikbād* signifie „honorable”; pour „lourd” on a le mot *kābēd*. Si l'on regarde maintenant de nouveau le texte des lignes 11/12, on constate qu'on ne peut en tirer que l'auteur aurait eu en vue une division de troupes entre „légères” et „lourdes”; il veut seulement dire que les *gibbôrîm* (= les „héros”, cf. 2 Sam. xxiii 8 ss.) ne peuvent se sauver, malgré leur grande force; les *qallîm* ne sont pas si vites qu'ils peuvent trouver à temps un refuge; les *nikbādîm*, honorables, seront exposés à l'ignominie. Tout cela est du bon hébreu.

Ligne 12. Pour le sens du substantif יקום, cf. Gen. vii 4, 23; Dt. xi 6. Lacune: הבל]יהם תשים לאין; pour הבלים = idoles, cf. Dt. xxxii 21; 1 Rois xvi 13, 26. Il y a un espace vide entre le quatrième et le cinquième mot, et également en dessous, dans la ligne suivante, sans que la raison en soit apparente, cf. i 10, note.

Ligne 13. Première lacune: ת]פארתכה בכול; pour le premier de ces deux mots, cf. Is. lxiii 14. Les „temps fixés des témoignages” (מועדי תעודות) sont les jours de fête, en lesquels, lors de leur institution, Dieu a „témoigné”, et en lesquels les Israélites „témoignent” encore maintenant de sa gloire, en toute éternité. Deuxième lacune: מ]בןא.

Ligne 14. Première lacune: [מחשבת חס]דכה; deuxième lacune: [במרומי]ם איש להרים, de reconstruction très incertaine. Pour la construction invertie, supposée ici, cf. Is. xlix 6; en syriaque cette construction est très normale et assez fréquemment employée¹). Le texte rappelle encore 1 Sam. ii 8.

Ligne 15. Cf. Ps. viii 6.

Ligne 16. Commencement d'un nouveau chant. L'expression *ēl ēlîm* est probablement un superlatif comme *šîr ha-šîrîm*, etc. La lacune a été comblée d'après Ps. vii 7, donc: [בע]ברוה צוררי...

¹) Cf. Th. NÖLDEKE, *Kurzgefasste Syrische Grammatik*, 1898², p. 224.

Ligne 17. Première lacune [הלכנ], cf. Job xxix 3. Le *yod* qui précède immédiatement la deuxième lacune doit être la préformante d'un verbe à l'imparfait; on pourra lire quelque chose comme „nous illumine”.

Ligne 18. On pourrait compléter le texte de la façon suivante: [את הכן]...
...תוקד לשרפה.

Col. xv. Cette colonne a été composée par l'éditeur de deux grands morceaux totalement séparés et de deux petits fragments; elle avait été déchirée de haut en bas, et la partie du milieu manque. Les dix premières lignes du morceau droit avaient déjà été éditées par SUKENIK dans ses *Megillôt Genûzôt* I et elles avaient été traduites par TOURNAY, *RB LVI*, 1949, pp. 215-216; par VERMÈS, *o.c.*, p. 195; et par d'autres. Le reste d'une première partie de huit autres lignes a été suppléé à l'aide de deux petits fragments, trouvés séparément. Si l'on accepte que les morceaux, du moins les deux grands, sont les restes d'une seule colonne, on ne connaît pas encore la distance exacte qui les sépare. On peut mesurer celle-ci d'après ce qui manque dans la ligne 4, où on peut lire soit [הכוהנים], soit הכוהנים [בני אהרן]. Un seul mot ne suffit pas, car ainsi il n'y aurait pas assez de place dans d'autres lacunes qui ne sont pas plus grandes et où il faut plus d'un mot. Il faut donc donner raison à l'éditeur (cf. Planche XXX). Certaines restaurations partielles qui sont proposées ici ne sont que de pures possibilités; compléter tout ce qui manque est impossible.

Ligne 1. Lacune: [ועת העזרת לישראל]. Dans les colonnes précédentes on a lu des hymnes d'action de grâce après la victoire; ici on entend de nouveau qu'il y a un temps d'angoisse pour Israël. La transition est brusque et l'état actuel du texte est tel qu'on ne sait pas par quoi elle est motivée. Est-ce un nouveau signe que le texte est le produit d'un compilateur? Mais même un copiste peut avoir ajouté à sa Règle d'autres morceaux, trouvés ailleurs.

Ligne 2. Lacune: [עם...].

Ligne 3. Lacune: [אשר יובדו בו]. Dans les lignes 2-3 il est question d'un combat livré contre „le roi des Kitti'im” et de „toute l'armée de Bélial et de ceux qui se sont alliés avec lui”. Puisqu'un *roi* est nommé, et celui des Syriens a toujours été l'ennemi par excellence, on a l'impression qu'il s'agit ici de nouveau du roi syrien et de ses alliés ou troupes mercenaires étrangères.

Ligne 4 ss. Allocution du grand-prêtre avant le combat.

Ligne 4. Lacune: [הכוהנים בני אהרן].

Ligne 5. Lacune: [המלחמה... וספר]. „Plan de campagne” est la traduction de סרך עתו, littéralement „l'ordre de son temps” = ce qui doit être fait selon l'ordre du temps.

Ligne 6. Lacune: [ככה תוב... בספר סרך המלחמה]. La restauration du premier mot est assez probable, puisque le trait droit vertical du *taw* est encore visible; ce qui suit est une restauration hypothétique fondée sur le reste d'un trait d'un *mem* qu'on peut encore discerner à droite du dernier *he* (dernière lettre du mot restauré *milhāmāh*). „Le prêtre désigné” est une allusion à Deut. xx 2, et peut-être aussi à un passage perdu de la Règle.

Ligne 7. Lacune: [המלחמה... את]; traduction hypothétique.

Ligne 8. Lacune: [תחפז... במלחמה].

Ligne 9. La lacune doit avoir contenu des expressions parallèles aux précédentes.

Ligne 10. Lacune: [תשוקתם. .].

Lignes 11-18. Pour compléter (partiellement) ces lignes, l'éditeur s'est servi de deux petits fragments séparés (voir Pl. xlvii, nos 1 et 9). Du premier fragment, des lettres manquent des deux côtés et la reconstruction n'est pas aisée. On pourrait lire: 11 [המונים].

12. ועל[כול רוחי רשעה. 14. מא]ל על כול ה[רשעים. 13. בק]ץ בק[שו נפש.

15. [המפוק]דים ליום].

Ligne 11. Début du fragment gauche: ידם מרו[ממה]. Le mot הוותם est un pluriel de *hawwāb* avec suffixe; pour יקום cf. xiv 12. Le dernier mot est un imparfait du verbe *malal*, cf. Ps. xxxvii 2; le pluriel en est une *constructio ad sensum* par rapport à כול יקום, considéré comme collectif.

Ligne 13. Dernière lacune: ב[גבורת].

Ligne 14. Premier mot du fragment gauche: ג[בורי]. Fin de la ligne: למלחמה[ה בסדרי קדושים].

Col. xvi. Ligne 1. Lacune: [ש עמו ביום]; pour *qōdeš* comme désignation du pays d'Israël, cf. Ps. cxiv 2.

Lignes 3-9. Nouvelle instruction pour le combat contre les Kitti'im. Le texte de la Règle avait déjà donné des règles pour le commencement du combat (col. v 16 ss.); le rôle du prêtre avait été décrit col. vii 12 ss.; viii; ix. Ce qui nous est dit ici est comme un abrégé de tous ces passages, ou le texte d'un nouveau fragment.

Ligne 3. Lacune: [ביום ה[הוא]]. Pour les „trompettes de l'attention” (*zikkarôn*), cf. iii 7; vii 13.

Ligne 4. Pour „les portes du camp”, cf. vii 9, 17; viii 4.

Ligne 5. La graphie סדר תרועה semble être une faute du copiste pour תרועה לסדר. Le dernier mot de la lacune semble être [לה. .], le premier doit être deviné, p. ex. [יפקדו].

Ligne 6. Lacune: [לפניו אויב]? Pour *paga* cf. Job xxxvi 32. Dans l'expression ליד le mot *yad* doit signifier, non le côté, mais l'extrémité, cf. vii 7, donc la première ligne.

Ligne 7. Lacune: [כזהנים יתקעו בת]צוצרות. cf. vii 12 ss.

Ligne 8. Lacune: יריעו[ן תרעות מלחמה ב]קול. Pour l'idée que les Fils de lumière se souillent les mains dans le combat, cf. ix 1.

Ligne 9. Lacune: [חרדתם והכזהנים]. Le mot „continuera” veut traduire מתנצחת; en hébreu biblique on trouve le *nifal* de *naṣaḥ*, non le *hitpael* (cf. Jér. viii 5). En syriaque on connaît un *etpa'al* de la même racine, signifiant „celebris factus est”, „prosper se habuit” (J. BRUN, *Dictionarium Syriaco-Latinum*, 1911) et on peut se demander si מתנצחת ne le signifie pas également.

Ligne 11 ss. Ici on entend pour la première fois que les Fils de lumière ne sont pas invulnérables dans le combat, ils peuvent tomber. Dans col. i 13-14 il avait déjà été prévu que le combat serait dur et qu'il y aurait attaque et contre-attaque. Le passage rappelle de loin une épisode qui est racontée dans 2 Macc. xii 40 ss.: dans une action contre les Syriens des soldats juifs avaient été tués, ce qu'on expliquait par le fait qu'ils n'avaient pas

été tout à fait fidèles à leurs devoirs religieux. Dans le texte de la règle l'auteur suppose la même chose, en rappelant les jugements de Dieu de jadis.

Ligne 11. Lacune: [בליעל]. Si des Fils de lumière tombent dans le combat, c'est que Dieu le veut; Il s'en sert pour éprouver les autres soldats pour qu'ils soient braves et qu'ils fassent examen de conscience.

Ligne 12. Lacune: ית[קצו ב]ח[צוצ]רות.

Ligne 13. Lacune: ולמתקרב[ים במלחמה]. La situation devient dangereuse et c'est maintenant le grand-prêtre qui intervient.

Ligne 14. Lacune: ב[... אל ויד]יהם.

Ligne 15 ss. Allocution du grand-prêtre, dont l'allure générale est claire, malgré la condition très défectueuse du texte.

Ligne 15. Pour remplir la première lacune on peut imaginer plusieurs expressions, comme p. ex.: [אל ישראל חקר לב]ב. Au lieu de la transcription de SUKENIK יבחן il semble qu'on doive lire יבחן. Deuxième lacune: ב[בחיריו]לוא.

Col. xvii. lignes 1-3. Fin de la première (?) partie de l'allocution du grand-prêtre.

Ligne 1. Lacune: [עמוד אש ויעשם] בדלק, cf. Ex. xiii 21 ss. L'imparfait יכהו est difficile, on peut l'expliquer comme un imparfait duratif, comme dans i 10; cf. aussi Gen. ii 6 et d'autres textes, notamment Ex. xiii 22 (la colonne de nuée), Num. ix 16, 17 (encore la colonne).

Ligne 2. Lacune: משפ[ט] נדב ואבי[הוא] pour l'histoire de Nadab et Abihou, fils d'Aaron, cf. Lévi. x 1 ss. La fin de la ligne manque, mais le sens se laisse deviner, p. ex.: [כול העדה ואלעזר].

Ligne 3. Lacune: [כהנות ע]ולמים. Le sort des deux fils d'Aaron devait avoir une signification spéciale pour les membres d'un groupe dans lequel les prêtres jouaient un rôle si important.

Lignes 4-9. Dernière partie de l'allocution; après les exemples, tirés de l'histoire, le grand-prêtre laisse entendre une dernière exhortation.

Ligne 4. Première lacune: [כיא הבל]. L'avant-dernier mot complet de toute la ligne doit être lu בלוא, et non כלוא (SUKENIK; faute d'impression?), cf. la planche; la lettre suivante est plutôt un *het* qu'un *be*. On pourra donc lire la fin de la ligne [... בלוא חיל ולוא]. Le mot à suppléer derrière ולוא doit être un verbe au sens de „vaincre”; après ce verbe il y a encore place pour deux mots de longueur moyenne.

Ligne 5. Lacune: [אמת חסדי א]ל. Pour הוה et נהיה employés ensemble cf. DSD iii 15; xi 4; *Hôdâyôt*, III (Pl. 37), 33; voir aussi CDC ii 10; Sir. xlii 19; xlviii 25. Le participe *nifal* d'un verbe comme *hayab* a la signification d'un présent, au sens de l'imparfait hébreu en certains cas: ce qui se fait à présent (et ce qui continuera).

Ligne 6. Le „prince de l'empire de l'iniquité” peut être Béliat, mais aussi le roi des Kittî'im (cf. xv 2). Petite lacune: [ע]דותו (*‘edûtô*). Le verbe האדיר est à la 3me personne du singulier (= rendre sublime); le mot suivant doit être lu *limšārēt* (participe *piel*; ou infinitif araméisant?)

Ligne 7. Lacune: [בחירי י]שראל. Ici משרת est à lire *misrat*, cf. Is. ix 5.

Ligne 8. Petite lacune: [ב]מרומים. Plusieurs expressions des lignes 7-8 font penser à Is. ix 1ss.

Lignes 10-17. Après l'allocution, une nouvelle attaque commence.

Ligne 11. Première lacune: על מעמדו [ית]קעו. Les „chefs” semblent être les commandants des grandes unités, convoqués chez le grand-prêtre pour un conseil de guerre et pour entendre son allocution.

Ligne 12. Lacunes: [אנשי ישראל מע]רכת כתינים].

Ligne 13. Lacunes: [והלויים וכו']ל.

Ligne 14. Lacune: [ובצאת קול התר]ועה].

Ligne 15. Lacune: [בהצוצרות המרדף והמלחמה...]; on voit encore quelques restes du mot *milhāmāb*, qui permettent de le rétablir.

Ligne 16. Lacune: השל[לים... כן]ל חללים.

Ligne 17. Le premier mot „Michel” est incertain.

Col. xviii. Le texte de cette colonne est livré par un fragment complètement détaché du reste du manuscrit. Le commencement de toutes les lignes (quatorze en tout) manque, mais quelques restes en ont été conservés à gauche de la marge gauche de col. xvii.

Ligne 1. On peut combler la dernière (petite) lacune de cette ligne en lisant [תב]ל, cf. Prov. viii 31, תבל ארצו.

Ligne 2. Il est de nouveau question de la défaite d'Assour (la Syrie), nommée cette fois à côté des Fils de Japhet et des Kitti'im (expression qui peut résumer ce qui précède). L'auteur aime l'assonance: *Kitti'im yikkattū* (peut-être aussi *naftū b'nê jāfēt*, où il y a deux fois *n-f*).

Ligne 3. Première lacune: [לאין שארית ופלטה ביום].

Ligne 4. Première lacune: [בהצוצר]ות. Deuxième lacune: [מ]ושבי כתיים (pour le pluriel masculin, cf. Ez. xxxiv 13).

Ligne 5. Dans la lacune on peut lire [טרם] אוץ; est un infinitif; pour la phraséologie cf. Jos. x 13. Deuxième lacune: [וה]לויים; à première vue l'espace semble trop large pour ce mot, mais cela vient du fait que deux fragments utilisés par l'éditeur n'ont pas été bien ajustés, cf. la planche.

Ligne 6. Première lacune [ורא]שים ואנשי. La deuxième [אל]לים?

Ligne 7. Lacune: [מעשיכה].

Ligne 8. Première lacune: [כה]חסד. Deuxième lacune: [למע]ן שמכה הגדול וחסד[כה].

Ligne 10 ss. L'hymne d'action de grâces continue; de chacune des lignes manque la partie droite.

Ligne 10. Le texte a été corrigé par une autre main; dans la traduction nous suivons cette correction, et l'interprétation que l'éditeur en donne.

Ligne 11. Premier mot [ל]נו. Deuxième lacune: [מ]משלת האויב.

Ligne 12. Lacune: [ובמ]ות ארצכה נפלו [ע]ל. Le contexte demande que **במ** soient les premières deux radicales d'un mot hébreu, et alors on ne semble pas avoir d'autre choix que le mot **ובמות**; la reconstruction du reste du texte est évidemment hypothétique, elle est inspirée par Os. x 8 (cf. Luc. xxiii 30; Apoc. vi 16). Au lieu de **למגפה** (SUKENIK) il faut certainement lire **למגפה**.

Ligne 13. Dernier mot de la lacune: [וח]לב, cf. 2 Sam. i 22; pour **מגנתה** cf. Gen. xiv 20.

Ligne 14. Le commencement de la ligne manque, mais on peut en supposer le sens d'après Sap. xvi 15; 2 Macc. vi 26; Tob. xiii 2. Deuxième lacune: [וג]מול; troisième: [מ]שלת.

Ligne 15. Comme premier mot on peut supposer „de Béal”, „des Kitti'im”, ou autre chose.

Col. xix. La dernière colonne du texte actuel est représentée par un fragment complètement détaché du reste, dont manquent les marges droite et gauche. Les lignes 1-8 sont les restes d'une hymne d'action de grâce, les lignes 9-13 donnent des indications pour après (?) le combat. Le commencement (incomplet) des deux premières lignes a été suppléé par l'éditeur d'après un fragment trouvé à part.

Ligne 1. Fin: [. . . וצדקה].

Ligne 2. Commencement: [לך ויל תבל]; טל; fin:

Ligne 3. Commencement: [שן] . . .

Ligne 4. Fin: [השקה].

Ligne 5. Le texte fait allusion à Ps. xlviii 12; xcvi 8. La graphie מואדה au lieu de מאודה (en hébreu biblique toujours מאד) est à remarquer et à rapprocher d'autres du même genre dans les documents de Qumrân.

Ligne 6. Il est fait allusion à Is. lx 11 ss.

Ligne 7. Première lacune: [מי בנות ע] . . .

Ligne 8. Pour le sens, cf. Dan. vii 14.

Ligne 10. Commencement: [גב] ורי . . .]. De nouveau les Kitti'im sont associés à Assour et à „tous les peuples”.

Ligne 11. Cf. Is. xxxi 8, prophétie de la chute d'Assour.

Ligne 13. Texte: [כול חל] לי כת[יים והלל]י שם [את אל ישראל] . . .

[Pendant la correction des épreuves de cet article, j'ai vu l'étude de l'abbé J. CARMIGNAC „*Les Kittim dans la Guerre des fils de lumière contre les fils de ténèbres*”, *N.R. Th.* Tome lxx, 1955, pp. 737-748. P. 738 l'auteur nous dit d'avoir appris de M. le Docteur HUNZINGER, éditeur de textes de Qumrân, que parmi les fragments qu'il doit éditer, il en a déjà identifié une soixantaine comme appartenant à trois ou quatre autres manuscrits de la Règle de la guerre. Le texte de ces fragments présente même des variantes.]

Selon l'abbé CARMIGNAC, le terme „Kittim” serait dans la Règle de la guerre une désignation des ennemis des Israélites en commun, donc tous les non-Juifs. Pour cette thèse il apporte de bonnes raisons, mais il ne me semble pas encore exclu que l'auteur de la Règle, en employant l'expression, vise parfois certains ennemis particuliers, comme p. ex. les Syriens.]

SLEEP: AN ASPECT OF JEWISH ANTHROPOLOGY

BY

JAMES G. S. S. THOMSON

Edinburgh

Two observations should be made by way of introduction.

(1) It is important to realise that the Old Testament references to sleep and other related matters are not very numerous. Not only so but they are purely incidental. That does not mean that they are unimportant, but it is a warning against making hasty deductions, or attempting to formulate definitive conclusions regarding the Hebrew attitude to sleep.

(2) It is salutary to remember that even in our day there is still no one theory of sleep that commands the unanimous assent of psychologists or neurologists. In this region the experts are still in the realm of conjecture. Sleep is still the crux in physiology and psychology. Nothing better than hypotheses have been offered to explain it. If we keep this in mind we shall be prepared to find that for the Hebrews too sleep was a mystery. It was not, however, an entrance to the realm of the weird and the uncanny as it was for other ancient peoples.

There are three roots used in Hebrew for sleep—*nûm*, *yāšēn*, and *rāḏham*. Properly speaking *nûm* means to be drowsy or to slumber; *yāšēn* signifies to sleep; while *rāḏham* is used to describe a heavy or deep sleep; and in spite of some overlapping the differences in meaning which these three roots convey are observed in the Old Testament. See, e.g., Ps. cxxi 4, Is. v 27, Jb. xxxiii 15. Cf. also the Ugaritic Text Krt. i 31 ff., where sleep and drowsiness are distinguished.

Nûm describes an altogether lighter form of sleep than that implied by *yāšēn* or *rāḏham*. *T·nûmāh* answers to what the modern neurologist describes as the pre-dormitum stage of sleep; i.e., the period that precedes sleep proper when the flow of thought becomes modified. As conscious thought detaches itself increasingly from volition the sleeper slips imperceptibly into what the Old Testament calls *šēnāh*, and, on occasion, into *tardēmāh* where the flow of thought continues in dreams and figments of the imagination.

Nûm and *yāšēn* occur in Syriac where *naūmā'* signifies slumber, and *šentā'* means sleep. *Rādham* is not found in Syriac but *damkūthā'* or *ṭulā'ā'* describe the *tardēmāh* of the Old Testament. The root *yāšēn* occurs five times in Ugaritic Texts (Krt. 31, 33, 119, 222, 1 Aqht. 151). It occurs in parallelism with the root *nhm* to be drowsy. *Nûm* and *yāšēn* occur in Arabic under the forms *nām* and *wasan*, but in meaning are not distinguished so clearly as in Hebrew and Syriac; there being another root to describe the lighter form of sleep, namely *na'as*. To describe the Hebrew *tardēmāh* some such phrase as *naūm ghariq* would be used.

Evidence of distinction in meaning between these three Hebrew roots is also found in the LXX. *Nûm* occurs eleven times in the Old Testament and in all but two of these either *νυστάζω*, or *νύσταγμα*, or *νύσταγμός* is used. The two exceptions are *ύπνώδης* and *ύπνώω*. In translating *yāšēn* the LXX again reveals a high degree of uniformity. Of twenty-five references either *ύπνώω* or *ύπνος* is used twenty-one times. *καθεύδω* occurs twice, while *κοιμάω* and *ἐπικοιμάομαι* are each used once.

Rādham, however, seems to have caused a good deal of trouble to the Greek translators. The root occurs fourteen times in the Old Testament, and no fewer than nine different Greek words are used to translate it. In two of the fourteen references (Pr. x 5, Dn. viii 18) the root is not rendered at all. *Ἐξίστημι* Jg. iv 21, *νυστάζω* Ps. lxxvi 7, LXX lxxv 7, and *κατανευγμένος* Dn. x 9, each occur once, and with *ρέγχω* which is found twice (Jn. i 5, 6) render the verbal forms of *rādham*. The substantival form, *tardēmāh*, occurs seven times and is translated by five different words. These are *ἐκστασις* Gn. ii 21, xv 12, *φόβος* Jb. iv 13, *δεινός φόβος* Jb. xxxiii 15, *θάμβος* 1 Sm. xxvi 12, *ἀνδρόγυνος* Pr. xix 15, and *πνεύματι κατανύξεως* Is. xxix 10. Evidently *rādham* puzzled the Greek translators to such an extent that they did not know quite what to make of it.

The root is found in Arabic and its connotation there probably explains why it came to mean deep sleep in Hebrew. If C. J. BALL is correct in assuming a primitive biliteral root for *rādham* it would be *dam* (which sometimes occurs as *ṭam* or *tam*) meaning to stop up, close, or seal. The assumed biliteral root was, of course, trilateralized and occurs in Aramaic as *dmk* meaning closed-like; cf. the Syriac *damkūthā'* deep sleep. Another trilateralized form of *dam* is *'ṭm* which describes shut lips and stopped ears. Assyrian has the root *katāmu* which is used of closed lips or mouth, or a door that is shut. In Arabic

it has been trilateralized by *r* and has maintained its original meaning, that of blocking up a hole, stopping a breach, patching a garment. Now it is in this form that the root occurs in Hebrew and is used with reference to sleep. The sleeper is closed against the outer world. His organs of sense perception are, for the time being, stopped up or shut; and it was felt that neither *nûm* nor *yāšēn* was adequate to describe this rarer sleep phenomenon. It also had a special significance for the Rabbis. In a midrash in Genesis three kinds of *tardēmāb* are distinguished: the *tardēmāb* of sleep (Gn. ii 21), the *tardēmāb* of prophecy (Gn. xv 12), and the *tardēmāb* of unconsciousness (1 Sam. xxvi 12).

There are two main elements in the Old Testament view of sleep.

(1) Sleep is the result of a Divine intervention. It is nowhere said that *tenûmāb*, the lighter form of sleep, comes from the Lord, but in this pre-dormitum state God might draw near and speak to men. But *šēnāb* and *tardēmāb* do come from the Lord (Gn. ii 12, 1 Sm. xxvi 12). In Is. xxix 10 it is a *rûah tardēmāb* that the Lord pours out, although here sleep is spiritual blindness or moral insensibility. In Jer. li 39, 57 the Lord threatens the Babylonians with a *š'nath 'ōlām*. The phrase *kēn yittēn lîlîdhō šēnā'* occurs in Ps. cxxvii 2 where *šēnā'* may be taken as a direct accusative or as an accusative used adverbially. Ps. lxxvi 6 even suggests that on occasion the Lord casts both war horse and chariot into a dead sleep.

(2) Closely related to the notion that sleep is divinely induced is the idea that sleep is a state of death. The phrase *š'nath 'ōlām* (Jer. li 39, 57) means that a temporal, has become a perpetual, state. The psalmist prays that God will lighten his eyes *pen 'išan hammāweth* (xiii 4); and perhaps the words "I lay down and I slept; I awaked again, for the Lord sustains me" (Ps. iii 6) should be considered in the light of the previous phrase. It may be that this concept of sleep lies behind the remark in Ps. iv 9: "In peace I will both lie down and sleep; for thou O Lord makest me dwell in safety."

The natural corollary of this notion is, of course, that death itself is spoken of as sleep. This idea is found in the Ugaritic Texts. "Fly over the grave of my son, to disturb him in his sleep". (bsnth, 1 Aqht. 151). The annual burial and rising of the fertility gods was also understood in terms of sleep. The idea that death is a sleep is also found in the Old Testament. In Jb. xiv 10-12 men lie down (presumably in death) and awake no more, nor are raised out of their sleep (*š'nāthām*). Conversely, Dn. xii 2 refers to the awakening (*hēqîš*)

of the many who sleep (*yāšēn*) in the dust. Cf. also Is. xxvi 19. In Ps. xc 5 the generations which God sweeps away are likened to a *šēnāh*.

But the question arises, How are we to interpret this figure of speech, namely, that sleep is a form of death? The Jewish interpretation of this simile in the intertestamental and later periods is plain from the literature of that era, but a hint of this explanation is also present in the Old Testament. In Ps. cxxxix 18 the writer exclaims: "When I awake I am still with thee." The Targum, the Talmud, Jewish expositors and Symmachus understand *bēqīš* to refer to resurrection, but since death has not been previously mentioned in the psalm there seems to be no good reason why *bēqīš* should be understood in this sense. The psalmist seems to be speaking of sleep, and on waking from sleep he finds that he is still with God; implying, tacitly at least, that during sleep he had been in the presence of God.

Now that is precisely the view of sleep that was held by the Jews in later times. A midrash, speaking of three incomplete phenomena, describes sleep as an incomplete experience of death. In another midrash on Genesis the words "if God set his heart on any man" (Jb. xxxiv 14 f.) are quoted to elucidate the phrase "the breath of life" (Gn. ii 7), and then follows the remark: "then his (man's) spirit is already in his (God's) hand." I.e., from the evening, when man goes to sleep he delivers his spirit to God. Then the words "and he (God) gathers his (man's) soul unto himself" (Jb. xxxiv 14 f.) are quoted with this comment: "then all men had already perished". The midrash on the words "they are new every morning; great is thy faithfulness" (Lam. iii 23) reads: "From the fact that thou renews us every morning we know that great is thy faithfulness to raise the dead; because sleep is regarded as a minor death: God, by suffering us to awake, thus gives us an earnest of the resurrection." LOUIS GINZBERG ¹), in reference to midrashic works which teach that the soul does not sleep, remarks that "this conveys the immortality of the soul because sleep is a likeness of death."

The same circle of ideas is found in the New Testament gospels, and one must assume that this is evidence of their being current among the Jews at the beginning of the C. E. The child of one of the rulers of the synagogue died, but the professional mourners who had come to the house are assured that she is only asleep. Her awaking

¹) L. GINZBERG, *The Legends of the Jews* (Philadelphia 1947), Vol. V, p. 74, n. 18.

from sleep took place when "her spirit returned" to her (Lk. viii 55). The death of another called Lazarus is described in terms of sleep, and his coming to life is spoken of as his being awakened out of sleep (John xi 11).

These ideas concerning sleep and death are also found in the Qur'ân. Surah xxxix 43 reads "Allah calls in the souls at the time of their death, and those who have not died, in their sleep; those upon whom he has decreed death he retains, and others he sends back until a stated time." Cf. also vi 60. Now this reference is significant for our subject because it is almost certain that these Qur'ânic passages had a Jewish origin. That is the opinion of the late RICHARD BELL who remarks in a footnote to Surah xxxix 43: "This is a Jewish and also a Christian idea" ¹⁾. Prof. KARL AHRENS also says: "The view (*Anschaunng*) that the souls in sleep are with God is proved to be Jewish" ²⁾.

And SIGMUND FRÄNKEL expresses the same opinion. In a short article on, *The Soul during Sleep* ³⁾, FRÄNKEL, commenting on Surah vi 60, xxxix 43, says that while it is conceivable that Muhammed might have developed the view that the soul is with God during sleep out of Jewish-Christian ideas concerning the life of the soul after death he (FRÄNKEL) is inclined to think that Muhammed borrowed it directly from Jewish circles. In support of this conviction FRÄNKEL quotes Berachoth 5a where it is laid down that a student who occupies himself with the study of the Torah until late into the night should use as an evening prayer the words of Ps. xxxi 6, "Into thy hands I commend my spirit." FRÄNKEL then quotes a Jewish morning prayer found in Abodhoth Israel ii 10 in the course of which occur the words, "I thank thee . . . that thou hast given back my soul to me." The same thought is expressed negatively in a late Hebrew poem for the 19th Ab in which it is said: "In that night God does not accept the deposit of the soul." Finally, FRÄNKEL quotes from a poem on the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus where it is said: "God takes their souls, leading them to heaven above, and leaves the watchmen to stand guard over their bodies." It is true that this refers to the sleep of death, but even so the souls of the seven youths were with God before their death. One has to re-

¹⁾ R. BELL, *The Qur'ân* (Edinburgh 1937), Vol. II, p. 463.

²⁾ K. AHRENS, *Muhammed als Religionsstifter* (Leipzig 1935), p. 98.

³⁾ S. FRÄNKEL, „Die Seele während des Schlafes“, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* (Leipzig 1902), Vol. LVI, p. 71-72.

member, of course, that Muhammed himself knew this story of the Seven Sleepers (see Surah xviii 9-11) and, therefore, it is just conceivable that he derived the idea of the abode of the soul with God during sleep from this same legend, but because of the available evidence it is more likely that he borrowed the idea of the soul sojourning with God during sleep from Jewish circles in Arabia.

Now this view of sleep which was prevalent among Jews in the post-Old Testament period represents a real departure from the view which the Old Testament literature allows us to presuppose. There, with the possible exception of Ps. cxxxix 18, the whole personality is involved in sleep and dreams. The idea of soul migration during sleep belongs to the intertestamental period and seems to have had a wide vogue. Nor does the Old Testament betray any morbid fear of sleep in spite of the fact that sleep was a form of death. The Old Testament suggests that sleep comes from God, and that the sleeper is in God's hands. There is, therefore, no morbid interest in dreams in the Old Testament.

Probably this explains why the Old Testament evinces no overriding preoccupation with the practice of incubation. Apart from Gn. xxviii 10 ff., and 1 Kg. iii 4 ff., the Old Testament displays no *certain* knowledge of the habit of sleeping in sanctuaries in order to ensure that a communication from the spirit world will be vouchsafed. And even from these two references it would be difficult to deduce evidence to support the contention that incubation was practised among Israelites. In his discussion of 1 Kg. iii 4 ff.¹) ERNST L. EHRLICH's sweeping assurance that here we have to do with "einer echten Inkubationsszene" is not substantiated by the facts as they are given in these verses. He is, however, much more cautious in his approach to the other relevant Old Testament passages. Cf. e.g., p. 27 ff., where he discusses Gn. xxviii 10 ff. Num. xxii 7 ff. might be construed to mean that Balaam practised incubation on that particular occasion but it should be noticed that Balaam was not a Hebrew, and that the *alleged* incubation took place not in Israelite but in Moabite territory. It has, of course, long been established that the argument from silence is a precarious one; it would, therefore, be hazardous to argue that because the Old Testament is silent on the matter incubation was not practised among the Hebrews. If the whole truth were known it might be found that this very silence is a

¹) E. L. EHRLICH, *Der Traum im Alten Testament* (Berlin 1953), pp. 19 ff.

witness to the fact that incubation was practised among Israelites but that it was condemned by the religious leaders who were concerned to preserve Jahwism in as pure a form as possible.

1 Sm. xxviii 6, in order to communicate the extent to which Saul had been abandoned by Jahweh, states that "When Saul inquired of the Lord, the Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by prophets". Here dreams are regarded as a regular media of revelation, and some scholars would feel free to assume that this implies some form of incubation. In addition, there is the consistent condemnation of "false prophets" who claimed to have received dreams from Jahweh. Were these dreams dismissed, not because of their contents but because they were received during incubation? And we must also take cognizance of the fact that incubation was widely practised among peoples with whom Israel was in contact. It may, therefore, be that the few references in the Old Testament, and the evidence provided by the literature of other Semitic nations, point to the *probability* of the practice of incubation in Israel; on the other hand the fact must be faced that the Old Testament provides us with no *irrefutable* evidence that this practice was observed among the Hebrews. It is of interest also to notice that the Old Testament contains no hint of any consciousness of the necessity to create guilds of dream-interpreters such as were found among other Semitic peoples.

We must always remember that the references to sleep in the Old Testament are few in number; consequently it may be argued that the evidence is insufficient to enable us to speak dogmatically about the Old Testament view of sleep. But what evidence there is shows that in respect of sleep and dreams the Old Testament is amazingly modern. This is the more astonishing when one recalls the Assyrian, Babylonian and Egyptian attitudes to sleep; and the vagaries of the Greek mind in its view of sleep; and also the hesitancy with which medical science approaches the same subject to-day. Some medical experts argue that sleep is an involved psychological problem, others that this fascinating problem lies completely in the realm of neurology. There is still no established rule of behaviour in sleep, nor does there appear to be any stereotyped pattern for sleep during the night. The rhythm of sleep changes constantly. The most recent theory is that sleep is a conditioned reflex, and that it depends upon the fatigue of a "waking centre" rather than upon the stimulus of a "sleep centre". This uncertainty towards sleep on the part of modern

medical science throws into even greater relief the degree of sanity that apparently characterized the Hebrew view of sleep as that is reflected in the Old Testament.

It has been suggested above that the Old Testament attitude to sleep underwent a radical transformation among the Jews in the intertestamental and later periods. This transformation was due probably to the influence that Hellenism exerted upon Jewish thought during those periods. It has been said that "the only non-Greek nation (apart from the Romans) which learnt anything from the Greeks, or from semi-religious Greek philosophy, was the Jewish—at once the most stubborn and the most pliable of them all"¹). Whether that is an overstatement or not does not now really concern us, but it does serve to remind us of the powerful pressure from Hellenism to which Judaism was subjected in the post-Old Testament period. This pressure of new ideas was felt particularly in the concept of human personality, and that is why the modification of the Old Testament attitude to sleep in this period is so important. It sprang from changes that concerned matters much more fundamental than sleep or dreams. These changes concerned Jewish anthropology, which in turn raised such important questions as a doctrine of resurrection. And here there are three matters that merit our attention.

(1) The presuppositions concerning anthropology that underlay the Jewish view of sleep. It is true, as J. G. FRAZER has shown²), that among uncivilized peoples, ancient and modern, the belief is firmly rooted that during sleep, or sickness, or trance, a temporary separation between soul and body takes place. But in the Old Testament period that belief is not found among the Jews. This was due to the Hebraic view that the animated body was the *nepheš*. The Hebrews betray no thought of an original dualism of soul and body. As WHEELER ROBINSON has observed³), proof of the total absence of dualism in Hebrew psychology is found in the ease with which "the highest intellectual or spiritual activity" could be assigned to certain physical organs; while feelings of hunger, or even the sexual urge, could be attributed to the *nepheš*. Not dualism of soul and body but an essential unity of personality is what they stressed. The *nepheš* was not an entity separate from, or independent of, the body but the

¹) E. ROHDE, *Psyche* (London 1925), p. 554, n. 14.

²) J. G. FRAZER, *The Golden Bough* (London 1911), Vol. III, p. 36 ff.

³) H. W. ROBINSON, *Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament* (Oxford 1946), p. 180 f.

animating principle of the body. Now this high and sane view of man in the Old Testament produced a correspondingly reasonable and remarkably modern conception of sleep.

And conversely, when the Old Testament view of the unity of the personality was either modified or abandoned in the post-Old Testament period in favour of Greek dualism a view of sleep emerged which presupposed a dualistic anthropology. A rabbi is quoted as saying: "The soul fills the body, and when man sleeps it ascends and draws life for him from above." The following midrash on Deuteronomy is also significant: "All nations of the world provoke him (God) to anger, yet when they fall asleep their souls go up to him (for safe keeping) and yet he restores to everyone his soul." FERDINAND WEBER ¹) quotes a *tanhuma* as saying, "The soul seeks to withdraw from the body during life. It descends to heaven during sleep and returns in the morning as new." Philo held that the soul is a fragment of divinity. It is, therefore, pre-existent and immortal, and aspires to be freed from the body to return to the heavenly spheres from whence it came. Obviously among Jews influenced by Hellenism the relation of body and soul was understood dualistically; but that was alien to Old Testament anthropology which insisted on the inherent unity of the personality. And, as has been observed, the Old Testament and Rabbinical views of sleep are important because each presupposes an anthropology that conflicts with the other.

(2) The Jewish conception of sleep is also significant when it is related to the eschatology of the individual. It is rather remarkable that in spite of the unitary view of man the Hebrews not only progressed towards a hope of a future life but finally succeeded in reaching a doctrine of resurrection. The earlier hope, however, since it involved a transcendence of death, was of the highest significance for the later doctrine of resurrection. Cf. e.g., the influence that the belief in the survival after death of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob has had in both Jewish and Christian concepts of a future life ²). On the other hand it might be said that the unitary view of man tended to hold up progress towards a doctrine of resurrection. Doubtless Greek dualism made it easier for the Jews to understand

¹) F. WEBER, *System der Altsynagogalen Palästinischen Theologie* (Leipzig 1880), p. 222.

²) D. S. MARGOLIOUTH, "Arguments from the Pentateuch for the Future Life", *The Expositor*, Vol. XX, (1920), p. 104 ff.

the hope of immortality, and tended to confirm them in that belief, and also helped them towards a doctrine of resurrection.

But the significant point is that the Greek view of the immortality of the soul only did not satisfy the Jews. In loyalty to Old Testament anthropology they insisted that the soul had to be restored to the body; cf. Is. xxvi 19, Dan. xii 2. I.e., Judaism modified Greek dualism by insisting on the resurrection of the body. But in addition to the Greek view of immortality the new notions of sleep also made a minor contribution to the preparation for a doctrine of resurrection.

Once the soul was felt to be "a lamp of the Lord" filling the body with light when man is awake (Pr. xx 27) the way was opened up leading to the idea that in sleep the soul escapes and temporarily returns to God. Hence the morning prayer: "Blessed art thou O God who restorest the souls unto the dead bodies." The concept underlying this prayer throws light upon the entire belief in resurrection. To the pious death became a prolonged sleep. Hence the hope that "those who sleep in the dust shall awake" articulated itself. As at the awakening from sleep in the morning so at the awakening in the future; the souls which shall have departed in death shall return again to their bodies. Cf., these words from Pirké de Rabbi Eliezer: "The sleep at night is like this world, and the awakening of the morning is like the world to come The awakening in the morning is like the future world To a man who awakes out of his sleep in like manner will the dead awake in the future world."

But although Hellenistic notions of what happens after death influenced the course of developments which Jewish eschatological ideas followed, the Jews, as has just been observed, did not accept them completely. It is significant that there is no trace of Greek influences in Ben Sirach. Greek thinking postulated the dual nature of man, the imperishable soul inhabiting a mortal body during life then leaving this tenement at death which presently dissolves and perishes, while the soul flies away to that region of spiritual existence to which by its essential nature it belongs. But in its search for an adequate doctrine of a future life Judaism took its own way. Not all Jewish thinkers shared Philo's hope of a purely spiritual immortality which he expresses in these words: "This is the noblest definition of an immortal life, to be possessed by a fleshless and bodiless love and friendship for God."

Many, dissatisfied with the concept of a final liberation of the

soul from the body, its prison-house or sepulchre, and true to Old Testament ideals, demanded a reunion of soul and body to live again in the unity of the nature of man. In the words of the midrash on Lam. iii 23, which regards sleep as a minor death: "God, by suffering men to awake, thus gives them an earnest of the resurrection." Judaism did come to a belief in the resurrection of the body, and made it one of her cardinal doctrines, but the view of sleep which is now seen to presuppose resurrection helped to formulate that belief.

(3) What are the presuppositions underlying the contrasting Old Testament and Rabbinical views of sleep concerning dreams, and these regarded as a medium of revelation? In the Old Testament dreams are not explained either physiologically or psychologically but are ascribed to intercourse with God. The Old Testament assumes that no region of the unified personality is beyond the influence of God but emphasis is laid upon the conscious operation of the human faculties. Perhaps this explains why references to dreams in the Old Testament are not numerous.

But dreams are represented there as part of the means by which God spoke to men ¹⁾. And if sleep is, in the opinion of F. W. H. MYERS, a positive and definite phase of the personality co-ordinate with the waking phase then there is scope for a revelation of God's will in sleep as recorded in the Old Testament; at least there seems to be nothing in modern psychology to preclude the possibility of a Divine manifestation in dreams. Here we are again reminded of the astonishing modernity of the Old Testament view of sleep and dreams. Indeed what little evidence there is suggests that the Hebrews regarded dreams pretty much as men of good sense regard them to-day. They had pleasant dreams (Ps. cxxvi 1) and nightmares (Jb. vii 14). For them too dream experiences personified the shadowy and the evanescent (Jb. xx 8, Ps. lxxiii 20). Dreams were proverbially deceptive (Ec. v 2, 6; Is. xxix 8), and had their genesis in the cares of daily life (Ec. v 2, 6), and were, therefore, reflections of a man's waking experiences (Sir. xxxiv 1 f.).

The subject of dreams is the human spirit. The spirit that is active in the waking consciousness is also active in the dream consciousness, and acts according to the same laws. In the Old Testament a dream may be a communication from God but it does not clash with psy-

¹⁾ Cf. E. L. EHRLICH, *op. cit.*, p. 155 ff.

chological processes. The dream is the outcome of reality, the reality of conscious waking experience. As A. B. DAVIDSON points out for the Old Testament prophets dreaming and seeing in visions were forms of thinking. The contents of the dream or vision are creations of the mind itself. The prophet's mind in the moment of insight or revelation was in a state of activity. His whole mind was engaged. Emptiness and disorder are not the invariable essence of dreaming. No longer can the subconscious be termed the irrational part of man's nature. The stuff of which dreams are made is supplied by previous waking experience which is stored in the memory, but a new synthesis takes place in the mind during sleep, and through this synthesis perception of truth, or a fresh perception of the reality of things Divine, is granted.

Now these are the presuppositions that underlie the Old Testament view of sleep so far as dreams are concerned. In suggesting this we are not inferring that the Hebrews were aware of many mental processes which are now familiar to us. Perhaps it was this unawareness that led them to ascribe their dreams to the relevatory activity of God, but on the other hand there is nothing to discredit the belief that God did work through such psychical phenomena in order to reveal His will. The view that in sleep the mind liberates itself from the fetters of the body and thus transcends the activity of the waking consciousness which is confined to the limitations of time and space is nowhere countenanced in the Old Testament, and this because of the unitary view of personality. Waking or sleeping, living on earth or existing in sheol, the personality is an entity, unified and indivisible, hence the Old Testament sanity regarding sleep and dream phenomena.

But there was a tendency in the post-Old Testament period to forsake the Old Testament anthropology in favour of a dualistic view of personality, and this not only affected profoundly the theory of sleep but also of dreams and other related phenomena. The Orphic doctrine that the body is the 'grave' of the soul (σῶμα σῆμα), and that the soul awakes to its true life only when it is free from its prison produced the view that in sleep the soul leaves the body, converses with eternal things, and receives communications from heaven to which it is inaccessible by day. The soul slumbers when the body is active, but when the body slumbers the soul awakes and shows in many visions the approaching issues of doom and blessing.

And here we have the presuppositions that underlie the later

Jewish view of sleep when that is related to dreams. In Rabbinical literature there is abundant material relating to dreams, and this provides evidence of the extent to which Judaism has been influenced by dualistic tendencies in Hellenism. And this applies not only to simple-minded folks. Famous teachers frequently discuss dreams and lay down rules regarding them, suggesting that dreams were a preoccupation of many intellectual leaders of Judaism. This is in marked contrast to the Old Testament whose attitude to dreams and its manner of treating them is truly remarkable when one considers the enormous importance ascribed to them and to divinatory agencies in the Semitic world of which Israel formed a part. LOUIS GINZBERG supplies a number of references to several midrashic works ¹⁾ where dreams are explained as the result of the migration of the soul during sleep when the body was inactive. The soul's relation to the body is thought to be an external one. When man sleeps the soul ascends to the heavenly abode. Sometimes it receives communications which appear to the sleeper as dreams.

Of course, some of the Rabbis who were more 'advanced' did explain dreams psychologically. E.g., in Berachoth 56a it is reported that a Roman Emperor asked a tanna named Joshua what he (the Emperor) would dream about. Joshua replied: "You will dream that the Persians will vanquish and maltreat you."

Reflecting on this the whole day the Emperor dreamed accordingly.

¹⁾ L. GINZBERG, *op. cit.*, Vol. V, p. 80, n. 25.

SHORT NOTES

MUBAQQIR QARBÂTIM

Es ist vielleicht nicht ganz überflüssig, hier eine kleine Verbesserung zu *VT* iv, S. 413 zu notieren. Bei seiner Untersuchung zum Stamme *bqr* beruft Prof. M. Brč sich auf ein akkadisches Verbum *buqquru*, das mit Objekt *qarbâti* „to take care of sacrificial gifts“ bedeute (so nach W. MUSS-ARNOLT, *Handwörterbuch*, S. 183a). *qarbâti* bedeutet jedoch niemals „Opfergaben“ (nur „Fluren, Felder“) und ein Verbum *buqquru* existiert überhaupt nicht. An den Stellen, wo es vorliegen soll, liegt in Wirklichkeit das Verbum *mkr*, „bewässern“ vor, wie vor vielen Jahren H. ZIMMERN, *BSGW* LXVIII/5, S. 31, dargelegt hat. (C. BEZOLD gibt in seinem *Glossar* auf S. 179b die richtige Lesung, auf S. 92a ist jedoch die falsche stehengeblieben).

Wien

R. BORGER

TWO ADDENDA TO

“SOME NOTES ON לִיץ AND ITS DERIVATIVES”¹⁾

I. לִיץ IN PHOENICIAN INSCRIPTIONS

In a recent study the writer observed that there are no cognates which throw light upon the meaning of *lš*²⁾. I was not unaware of the occurrence of this root, or at least a derivative of it, in Phoenician inscriptions, since it is listed in the glossary of HARRIS' *Phoenician Grammar*³⁾. However, I felt that the non-biblical uses of this root help little, if at all, in understanding the biblical uses. Nevertheless it is true that the light thrown upon non-biblical vocabulary by biblical lexicography may in turn help to corroborate and strengthen our conjectures as to the meanings of Hebrew words.

Among the Cyprus Inscriptions⁴⁾ appears the phrase *mlš hksym*.

¹⁾ *V. T.* V, No. 2, p. 163-179.

²⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 164.

³⁾ HARRIS, Zellig S., *A Grammar of the Phoenician Language*, p. 114, 119.

⁴⁾ *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum* i 44, 88; see COOKE, G. A., *North Semitic Inscriptions*, p. 60, 73.

COOKE ¹⁾ translates "interpreter of the thrones" citing Gen. xlii 23 as support for the meaning of *mlš* ²⁾).

From Karatepe ³⁾ comes the royal inscription of Azitawadd of which line 8 reads in part: *b'br b'l w'lm wšbrt mlšm* which GORDON ⁴⁾ translates "by the grace of Baal and the gods and the council of dignitaries." GORDON further states ⁵⁾: "The point of departure for my conjectural interpretation is *mlšm*; *mlš* occurs in the honorific title *mlš bkrsym* in Phoenician inscriptions from Cyprus." Later, however, GORDON revised his translation at this point and substituted "assemblage of lares" for "council of dignitaries" citing Is. xliii 27 as support ⁶⁾).

In the Cyprus texts cited above one might better understand *mlš* as "advisor"; what would "interpreter of the thrones" mean? The same holds true of the Karatepe inscription. Here we would read "council of advisors" for *šbrt mlšm*. Or could *šbrt* have the same sense as *šbr* in Judges vii 15 — "interpretation" — so that we might read "interpretation of advisors"?

The problem which now arises is this: What is the relationship of *mlš* with the sense here suggested and that proposed for *liš* in the previous article, i.e. *babble*? The first clue might be found in our interpretation of Is. xliii 27 ⁷⁾. Here we understand *mēliš* to refer to the prophets. Although this is the only use of the word as a synonym for *nābhē* it is not impossible when we recall the ecstatic, "speaking in tongues" behavior of the early prophets. They were in fact babblers in the strictest sense of the term.

Furthermore, in several passages we see the prophets functioning as court advisors. A classic example is that in 1 Kings xxii 5ff. Here we see 400 prophets advising the two kings to go to battle against the Syrians and engaging in ecstatic prophetic activity — *w'kol-bann'bhē'im mithnabbē'im liḥnēhem*. It is precisely this interpretation which is to be given to the Karatepe inscription: Azitawadd tells of his exploits which he carried out "by the leave, permission, help,

¹⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 61.

²⁾ *mlš* also appears in CIS i 22 and 350 but these texts are not available to me.

³⁾ I am indebted to Prof. James MULENBURG for urging me to investigate the value of this inscription for the study of *liš*.

⁴⁾ GORDON, C., *JNES*, 8, 1949, p. 109.

⁵⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 113.

⁶⁾ GORDON, C., *Introduction to Old Testament Times* 1953, p. 199 and n. 7.

⁷⁾ *V.T.* V, p. 168. GORDON's interpretation in *Introduction to Old Testament Times*, p. 199, n. 7, seems to this writer to be ill-advised.

grace, of" ¹⁾ Baal, the gods, and a group of court advisors — *šbrt mlym*.

Thus we would suggest that *mly* in the Phoenician inscriptions is to be understood to mean *fluent speaker* or *advisor* and that it is related to *lly* — to babble, talk freely — through the activities of men such as the ecstatic court prophets of 1 Kings xxii.

II. לִיִּי IN THE ZADOKITE FRAGMENTS ²⁾

The noun derivative *lāšōn* appears twice in the document, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*: i 10 and ix 36 ³⁾. CHARLES translates "scornful man" (i 10), "scornful men" (ix 36), and notes that the phrase in ix 36 "is from Isa. xxviii 14" ⁴⁾.

In neither case is there sufficient context to determine beyond question the sense of *lāšōn*. However, in i 10, 11 'is *lāšōn* is characterized as having talked to Israel with "lying words". It is interesting to note that LXX in Prov. ix 12, in explaining the second line, uses ψεύδεις — lie, falsehood, untruth. As was previously pointed out ⁵⁾ a liar is better characterized as a babbler than as a mocker or scorner. Hence "the babbling fellow" is preferable in i 10.

There is even less support for a rendering one way or the other in ix 36, but on the basis of my previous treatment I suggest "babbling fellows" for 'anšē *hallāšōn*. There may be some connection between i 10, viii 1, 2, and ix 36 in which case the same justification as supported the translation in i 10 would apply in ix 36.

Syracuse, New York

H. NEIL RICHARDSON

A NOTE ON 'AL, L°, AND FROM

The purpose of these lines is to enter a protest against statements sometimes made that Semitic 'al and l° can have the 'meaning' of *from*. It would be a strange semantic development that a word meaning *on, upon, over* should come to have such a very different meaning as

¹⁾ OBERMANN, J., *New Discoveries at Karatepe*, p. 19.

²⁾ I am indebted to Prof. Millar BURROWS for reminding me of the occurrence in this document of this phrase.

³⁾ CHARLES, C. H., ed., *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, p. 801.

⁴⁾ *Ibid.*

⁵⁾ V. T. V, p. 165.

from. A comparison presents itself in the French use of *sur*. The French idiom for 'he took it from the table' is 'Il l'a pris sur la table'. But this does not show that *sur* means *from*. The word *sur* like '*al*' means *on, over*. But whereas English expresses directly whence the object was taken, French expresses directly where it was when taken and so indirectly also whence it was taken: He took it [from where it was] on the table. The same difference of approach is evident in the English sentence 'He took it from his pocket' and the corresponding French 'Il l'a pris dans sa poche', or in 'from the drawer' and 'dans le tiroir'. Here again *dans* does not 'mean' *from*, though French idiom requires its use where English employs *from*.

The relation of English *from* to Semitic '*al*' is entirely similar. In certain passages English may require the use of *from* in translating '*al*' without the latter having the 'meaning' of the former. Some of these have been recognized from early times. Thus Dan. vi 19 (18) שנתה נדת עלוהי LXX ὁ ὕπνος ἀπέσδη ἀπ' αὐτοῦ; Pesh. ܐܢܝܢ; Vg 'somnus recessit ab eo'; English AV 'his sleep went from him'. Dan. ii 1 שנתו נהיתה עליו (conject. נדרה); LXX ὁ ὕπνος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο ἀπ' αὐτοῦ (so also Theodotion); Vg 'fugit ab eo'; AV 'his sleep brake from him'. Ps. lxxxix 6 בצאתו על ארץ מצרים; LXX ἐν τῷ ἐξελθεῖν αὐτὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου; Pesh. ܐܢܝܢ. G. R. DRIVER is no doubt right in finding the use in Ps. iv 7 where he reads נָסָה עָלֵינוּ אֹר 'פניך יהיה' 'the light of thy countenance has fled from us'¹). Its occurrence is also suggested by M. DAHOOD in Zech. ix 16 where he reads 'for the slingstones of the stranger are put to flight from his land'²).

In addition to Hebrew and Aramaic this usage is also found in the Phoenician inscription of Ahiiram נחת תברח על גבל which LIDZBARSKI translated 'May peace fly from Gebal'³).

As Hebrew also has the compound מעל, the question suggests itself whether it is possible to discern a definite principle governing the choice of one or the other in the kind of sentence here discussed. No such principle is obvious from an examination of the texts, except that מעל must be used with those verbs which can equally

¹) VT I (1951), p. 247.

²) Theological Studies (U.S.A.) xiv (1953), p. 86.

³) Nachr. Ges. Wiss. zu Göttingen. Phil.-hist. Kl. (1924), p. 45 f. Cf. L. SEM-KOWSKI, Biblica VII (1926), p. 95.

admit the sense of *into* or *off, from*. With verbs signifying removal, separation and the like there is no such ambiguity.

It has also been stated that the preposition *l* sometimes 'means' *from* in Ugaritic¹). As this language apparently did not use the common preposition *min*, some other means had to be employed to express the idea and this was done by *l*. But it seems very improbable that it had the 'meaning' of *from*. Rather the preposition *l* with the meaning 'with regard to' and the like in certain verbal combinations suggested the idea of separation or removal, and so substituted for *from* as French *sur* and *dans* in the examples given above. Thus as *yṯb lḥkl* 'he returns with reference to the palace' has the sense of 'he returns to the palace', and *yṯb lkḥl* 'he sits with reference to the throne' that of 'he sits on the throne', so also *yrd lks* 'he descends in relation to the throne' has the sense of 'he descends from the throne'.

The same explanation may be given of the Hebrew examples of this use of ל. Here also it may be agreed that English idiom in certain phrases requires or at least allows the use of *from*. Gen. iii 24 מקדם לִגְן-עֵדֶן on the analogy of מֵעַל ל־ and מִתַּחַת ל־, both Gen. i 7, is 'on the East of', lit. 'on the East in relation to'. Gen. i 6 מִבְּדֵיל בֵּין מַיִם לַמַּיִם 'dividing waters from waters' is lit. 'between waters in relation to waters'.

The use of לִנְצַח in Lachish Letter iii 10 is also appealed to as meaning 'from eternity'. In the context it certainly signifies 'at no time in the past'. נֶצַח is similarly used of the past in Am. i 11 and Jer. xv 18. The literal sense would be 'with regard to perpetuity'.

Two instances are adduced with the verb שָׁאַל. 1 Sam. i 28 הוּא שָׁאַל לַיהוָה is quoted as meaning 'he is asked from Yahweh'. The explanation of the phrase is given not by i 20, 27 where Hannah says she prayed to the Lord for the child Samuel, but by i 11 'I will give him to Yahweh all the days of his life', and by i 28, the verse in which the words occur, 'And I on my part have lent him (הִשְׁאֵלְתִּיהוּ) to Yahweh; all the days of his life he is lent to Yahweh'. The translation 'he is asked from Yahweh' does not fit the context of this verse.

With regard to the other passage it may be noted, firstly, that with the person from whom something is asked we find (1) מִן, Jg. viii 24; (2) מֵאֵת, 1 Sam. viii 10; (3) מֵעַם, Is. vii 11; (4) or the person is indicated by a pronominal suffix, Ps. cxxxvii 3 (the only instance). The person questioned is sometimes introduced by אֵת, Jer. xxxvi 17.

¹) C. H. GORDON, *Ugaritic Handbook, Grammar* (Rome 1947), p. 10.1 and 10.11.

Secondly, it may be noted that with this verb שאל the preposition ל is used (1) with the person for whom something is asked, 1 Kg. ii 22, or for whom enquiry is made, Num. xxvii 21; (2) concerning whom enquiry is made, Gen. xxvi 7; (3) to whom an enquiry is addressed, 2 Kg. viii 6 'When the king asked the woman, she told him', RSV. In some cases the precise force of ל may be doubtful. Thus Gen. xliii 27 וישאל להם לשלום 'he enquired about their welfare', RSV, may be literally 'he asked them concerning welfare', or conceivably 'he asked regarding them concerning welfare'. The latter is suggested in BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, *Lex.* for Ex. xviii 7 'ask each for (or, about) his fellow as to welfare'. Further, in every case where שאל לשלום occurs, the context suggests 'greet him (them)' 'ask after his (their) welfare'¹. Especially may be noted 2 Sam. xi 7 ... וישאל לשלום המלחמה 'he asked how the fighting prospered'. There thus appears to be no adequate reason for finding the sense of 'from' in 1 Sam. xxx 21 וישאל להם לשלום and the translation 'he asked of them for peace'.

The conclusion to which we are led is that neither preposition 'means' *from*, but that both are so used in certain collocations of words that the context suggests the idea of removal or separation and must or can be replaced in English by *from*.

Chipping Norton.

EDMUND F. SUTCLIFFE

¹ Gen. xliii 27; Ex. xviii 7; Jg. xviii 15; 1 Sam. x 4; xvii 22; xxv 5; xxx 21; 2 Sam. viii 10; xi 7; Jer. xv 5.

REVIEWS

J. BOTTÉRO, *Le problème des Habiru à la 4ème rencontre assyriologique internationale*, Cahiers de la Société asiatique, XII, 208 pp. avec Table des auteurs cités. Paris, Imprimerie Nationale, 1954.

Parmi les heureuses institutions de l'après-guerre il faut compter ces réunions internationales qui assurent un contact plus étroit entre les spécialistes des différentes nations. Au nombre des plus efficaces se trouvent les „Rencontres assyriologiques” qui, bien préparées et pas trop nombreuses, se consacrent à quelques thèmes précis. C'est en 1953 que le problème des *Habiru* a été traité. Il a donné lieu à d'importantes communications; grâce à Mr J. B. le rapport s'est élargi en un véritable volume où l'on trouve de nouveaux textes, de nouvelles notes, une présentation claire et méthodique permettant de retrouver les textes et les thèmes, et enfin un essai de synthèse très prudent. Le classement et la numérotation des textes facilitent considérablement la consultation du volume et il sera aisé d'insérer à une place convenable les nouveaux documents qui ne manqueront pas d'apparaître dans les années à venir; on peut déjà noter personnellement sur son exemplaire les renvois aux notes additionnelles des pages 199-204, addenda et corrigenda dont quelques uns de grande valeur. L'ouvrage restera un „classique” du sujet.

Il commence par un résumé consciencieux des positions prises jusqu'à ce jour. Cette excellente introduction qui comporte près de trente pages en italique donne le status quaestionis où il était d'ailleurs inévitable que les positions de chacun risquent d'être quelque peu systématisées. La conclusion, *quot capita tot sententiae*, est peut-être un peu exagérée, mais il est certain qu'il n'y a pas accord entre les assyriologues, à plus forte raison si on leur ajoute les biblistes. Les textes bibliques n'ont pas été étudiés et ils n'avaient pas à l'être puisque certains comme E. DHORME repoussent tout rapprochement entre *Habiru* et *'ibrîm*.

Le terme de *Habiru* apparaît probablement à l'époque d'Agade (2500-2300). Puis à l'époque d'Ur III (2200-2050) le mot, écrit toujours idéographiquement SA. GAZ, désigne un malfaiteur ou un malandrin (textes 1-4). Un texte d'Asie Mineure, „cappadocien” parle en clair de *Habiru* vers la fin de cette période. Ces „hommes” (*avili*) sont en prison. D'après LANDSBERGER (contre J. LEWY) il n'y a pas là des „messieurs” et *avili* n'est que l'équivalent du simple „hommes”, Lu. MEŠ, que l'on trouve dans les textes N° 19ss., datant de l'époque babylonienne ancienne (1900-1800). Les textes de cette période, relativement nombreux, se répartissent en textes littéraires et textes administratifs. Dans les premiers les SA.GAZ=*Habiru* restent un élément peu sûr, venant peut-être du désert; d'après les seconds ils touchent des rations alimentaires et sont enrôlés pour des activités militaires, pas toujours au service du gouvernement. Aussi J. B. y voit alors une classe sociale. Dans

un texte inédit de Mari (texte 28) ils sont en parallèle avec les gens de la ville de Talhat (voir la note GOETZE p. 201). Une tablette de Suse (N° 35) montre que ce nom de *Habiru* est considéré comme Ouest-sémitique; il désigne en effet un groupe de soldats amorrites. Le texte FINKELSTEIN, donné en appendice et appartenant également à cette période, donne une liste de 8 SA.GAZ où l'on trouve d'excellents noms ouest-sémitiques (noter Abijau), mais joints à d'autres qui ne le sont point.

Il y a donc un mélange ethnique, patent également dans les listes d'Alalah où beaucoup de noms sont hurrites; un texte est du XVIII^{ème} siècle et les autres sont du XV^{ème}. Même si l'on donne au mot *šabu* qui les détermine le sens atténué de LU.MEŠ (cf. LANDSBERGER), les SA.GAZ se présentent là encore comme un élément nettement militaire. Il est intéressant de voir le texte 40 les rattacher chacun à un village. Ne serait-ce pas le contingent à fournir par chaque agglomération (cf. une tablette analogue à Ras Shamra, RA XXXVIII, p. 97ss)? Le *habiri*(sic) peut d'ailleurs accéder à des grades importants et voisiner avec le *amel biti* et le *mar šarru* qui semblent bien être des officiers.

L'ensemble des textes de Nuzi avait déjà été étudié, il est ici repris d'une manière particulièrement intéressante. On trouve le mot employé aussi bien au masculin qu'au féminin. Des *Habiru* contractent un engagement qui les rendent serviteurs temporaires de tel ou tel (mais d'autres qu'eux peuvent avoir le même statut). Le „terme *Habiru*, doublé à plusieurs reprises d'un qualificatif géographique et gentilice ... doit dénoter une qualité indépendante de l'origine ou de l'appartenance ethnique" (p. 69). Ils sont tous en condition servile et, pour Melle CASSIN, il semble que ce soient „des personnes, surtout étrangères qui, pour se voir reconnaître un statut, sont obligées de se mettre sous la tutelle d'un citoyen influent".

Chez les Hittites les *Habiri* (*Habirias* en leur langue) apparaissent comme des étrangers, ayant souvent des fonctions militaires, mais appartenant à l'une des plus basses classes de la société anatolienne. La situation est différente dans les lettres de Tell-el-Amarna. Les *Habiru* sont toujours un élément militaire, mais nettement hostile aux correspondants du Pharaon. Quand on va chez les SA.GAZ, on quitte les territoires (ou villes) du gouvernement. Les *Habiru* sont des „chiens errants" (*Halqu* litt. „perdu"; cf. l'Araméen *'ôbêd*, errant ou perdu de Deut. xxvi 5). Ils font figure de „soldats de métier, mercenaires qui se louaient au plus offrant" (BOTTÉRO p. 116).

Les textes les plus nouveaux avec ceux d'Alalah sont ceux de Ras Shamra. Leur apport est considérable, que ce soient les textes alphabétiques publiés par Mr VIROLLEAUD ou les textes syllabiques étudiés par Mr NOUGAYROL et en cours de publication. Ces textes ont fourni l'équivalent SA(G.)GAZ = *'pr*. Par deux fois (texte 158) l'idéogramme est suivi d'un complément phonétique de lecture incertaine, mais qui semble bien être *ru*. Ceci semble impliquer une lecture *Habiru*. Il est vrai qu'à Ras Shamra le mot s'écrit en clair *Habiri*. Voudrait-il lire *ubru*? la question se pose et voici pourquoi. Ces textes introduisent une donnée nouvelle où les uns verront une complication et les autres un éclaircissement.

Le texte 159, encore inédit (RS 15109) donne parmi les clauses d'un

acte de donation royale exemptant un domaine de certaines servitudes: „ditto: un homme *ubru* n'entrera pas dans sa maison, il n'accomplira pas le service des messagers royaux(?); des hommes SA.GAZ.ZA n'entreront pas” (verbe au sg) „dans sa maison”.

Le *ubru* est connu depuis longtemps. DELITZSCH rattachait le mot à une racine *hbr*, mais depuis on l'a réétudié et les deux notes les plus importantes sur le sujet sont celles de H. LEWY (*Orientalia* XI, 1942 p. 21 n. 1) et M. DAVID (*O. L. Z.* 1933, p. 214 n. 8). Pour H. LEWY et SPEISER (*AASOR*, XVI, 124) le *ubru* ou *ubaru* peut avoir un rang assez élevé; mais nous avons même constatation à Alalah. D'autres textes conduisent MEISSNER à y voir (cf. *SMV* 589 maintenant publié dans *Excavations at Nuzi* VI p. 19 (n. 136) Harvard 1950) un étranger de condition inférieure (*MAOG* III, 3 (1929) p. 45). L'équivalence entre l'*ubru* et l'*ubaru* est assurée par des textes comme le présage C.T. 41, Pl. 31, l. 25 où nous retrouvons pour l'*ubaru* exactement la formule mais sous forme affirmative que RS 15109 nous donne pour l'*ubru* et le SA.GAZ: *u-ba-ri a-na bi-ti-šu ir-ru-ub*: l'*ubaru* entrera dans sa maison. De plus une note précieuse de LACHEMAN (*BASOR* 78, p. 19) nous donne parallèlement à Nuzi des *ameluti u-ba-ru-ti ša mât Aššur* et des *Habiru ša mât Aššur*. En Mésopotamie comme chez les Hittites les *ubaru* sont des espèces d'étrangers, souvent en résidence dans le pays. H. LEWY a peut-être tort de s'appuyer sur *AFO* XII Pl. III No 2 pour discerner une opposition entre le *ubru* et l'indigène (*mar mati*) car le texte est vraiment trop lacuneux, mais le texte de MEEK (*Beit. Ass.* x 1 No. 11 l. 10) et le parallèle de REISNER (*SBH* Nr 25 132) *anaku nakraku anaku ubaraku* = „Je suis un étranger, je suis un *ubaru*” ne laisse place à aucune équivoque.

De plus un texte d'El Amarna sur l'*ubaru* peut servir de pendant à un texte de Ras Shamra sur les SA.GAZ. Tushratta (EA 20, l. 73) distingue parmi les gens qui lui sont soumis deux catégories, ceux de „mon pays” et ceux de „mon *ubaruti*”; ces derniers relèvent de lui sans être proprement de son pays. Or la tablette de Ras Shamra encore inédite (RS 17238 texte No 161) qui porte le sceau de Hattousil III spécifie que le roi hittite extradera les gens d'Ugarit qui „entreraient au milieu du territoire (A.ŠA, a bien voulu me préciser Mr NOUGAYROL) des SA.GAZ du Soleil”. Les SA.GAZ dépendent donc du roi hittite tout en ayant un territoire distinct.

On a voulu expliquer *ubru* par la racine arabe *wabara*. Ceci est très douteux car la racine arabe signifie non pas „passer, être étranger dans un lieu”, mais „s'arrêter, séjourner dans un lieu”; l'insistance porte non sur le passage, mais sur l'arrêt. Il semble bien préférable de croire qu'il y avait là un mot, une racine, étrangère, qui a subi toutes sortes de déformations, tant dans les voyelles que dans la consonne initiale (sur les rapports entre le *w* et les gutturales dans les cunéiformes, cf. VON SODEN, *Grundriss der akk. Gram.*, Rome 1953, § 24). *wabrum*, *wabirum*, *ubru(m)*, *ubaru*, *habiru*, *hapiru*, *apiru*, tout cela doit représenter le même terme prononcé par des bouches différentes. J. LEWY paraît avoir pleinement raison quand il signale (p. 202) que le parallélisme *ubrum*, SA.GAZ du texte 159 ne saurait être l'effet d'une simple coïncidence. La seconde clause ne devait pas ajouter beaucoup à la première, mais le scribe se devait de donner un inventaire complet des clauses de ce genre.

Avec ces textes l'essentiel de la documentation cunéiforme est acquise. Quatre textes babyloniens de la seconde moitié du II^e millénaire n'apportent pas beaucoup plus. Par contre le texte 167, d'époque néo-assyrienne, où se trouve mentionné un dieu *Habiru* a une graphie qui semble contredire celle de Ras Shamra; elle est favorable à la lecture *bi*, défavorable à la lecture *pi*. C'est sans doute pour cela que J. B. a préféré parler des *Habiru* et non des *Hapiru*. Des textes d'époque récente, mais reflétant une tradition donnent comme équivalent à SA.GAZ, *habbatu* (brigand) et non *Habiru*. Il convient de signaler qu'un texte égyptien publié par STEINDORFF (*Aeg. Zeit.* 38, 1900 p. 15-18 No 12; cf M. MÜLLER, *O.L.Z.* 5, p. 225-230) donne à côté d'un *'pr-b'* un *hbt* dont on ne voit pas sans cela l'étymologie; cette liste date de la XVIII^e dynastie et provient sans doute de Haute Egypte.

L'ensemble des textes égyptiens a été étudié par G. POSENER dont on sait la compétence en la matière. Ces textes connaissent des *'prw* (au pluriel) correspondant parfaitement aux *'prm* de Ras Shamra. Peu après 1500 ils sont représentés dans une tombe thébaine, filtrant le vin dans la région d'El-Qantara sur la frontière palestinienne; ils ont toutefois le type égyptien. Vers 1430 on les trouve sur une liste de captifs, entre les frères de rois et les bédouins Shasu, ce qui évoque la situation des *Habiru* d'Alalah. Vers 1300 il y en a dans la montagne près de Beth-Shean en révolte contre Séthi Ier, ce qui évoque la situation des *Habiru* d'El Amarna, 50 ans auparavant. Deux textes romancés du début de la XIX^e dynastie, donc à peu près de la même époque, les mentionnent en Palestine lors des campagnes de Toutchmès III. Sous Ramsès II et ses successeurs ils sont en Egypte, mais dans une situation inférieure, chargés de gros travaux. Ils reçoivent des rations pour transports de pierre, ou encore ils sont attachés à un domaine que Ramsès III donne au clergé. Sous Ramsès IV on les trouve dans les carrières de Haute Egypte. C'est la dernière mention.

Il ne faut pas négliger un autre texte, parmi les plus anciens puisqu'il date de Toutchmès III dans la première moitié du XV^e s. Celui-ci guerroyant en Palestine ne rencontre pas de *'prw* comme le fera Aménophis II, mais il rencontre deux *'pr* dans la région, le „grand *'pr*” et le „petit *'pr*”. Mr VIROLLEAUD a signalé que dans les tablettes de Ras Shamra on rencontre également un „grand *Hbr*” et un „petit *Hbr*”. Là encore le rapprochement paraît difficilement évitable.

Reste à s'efforcer de préciser le sens et l'étymologie du mot. Dans des pages solides et précises, très nuancées d'ailleurs (p. 153ss), J. B. montre que le mot ne peut avoir une origine accadienne (voir aussi la note de VON SODEN). Une origine Ouest-sémitique est douteuse et l'on peut avec B. LANDSBERGER songer au hurrite. De même qu'il nous a paru que le même mot devait se prononcer de la manière la plus diverse, de même il est probable que le sens a dû évoluer et être compris, ici d'une manière, là d'une autre. Peut-on déterminer ce que comprenaient par là les gens de Palestine, cette région où les Egyptiens trouvaient des *'prw*?

Quoique le livre s'en abstienne, le bibliste ne peut éviter de se poser la question de l'identification entre les *'ibrim* de la Bible et les *ubru*, *ubaru*, *habiru*, *'apiru*... Si l'on admet que toutes ces désignations se réfèrent à un même terme, l'objection qui arrêtaient un esprit aussi averti que Mr DHORME

dans l'identification *'prm* = *'brm* disparaît. Il faut avouer que la manière dont on parle des *'brm* dans la Bible correspond bien à celle dont nos textes cunéiformes et égyptiens parlent des autres. On a remarqué très justement que *'ibri* n'était pas pour les Israélites une désignation nationale, ce n'est qu'à la fin de la période biblique que le terme a pris ce sens. Ce n'est pas un ethnique et 1 Sam. xiv 21 prend soin de distinguer Hébreux et Israélites. L'état du texte traduit un embarras, mais on y voit d'une part les Hébreux qui ont été avec les Philistins, de l'autre les Israélites qui ont été avec Saul. Comme *Habiru* dans les cunéiformes, *'ibri* est un terme dont se servent les sédentaires civilisés, Égyptiens ou Philistins pour désigner des gens qui sont „en marge”. Sur 34 mentions d'Hébreux dans la Bible, il y en a 30 dans l'Octateuque (non pas Pentateuque comme il est écrit par erreur dans les *Études sur le code de l'alliance* p. 44). Dans 18 cas les *'ibrîm* sont opposés aux Égyptiens, dans 8 aux Philistins et en Gen. xiv 13 à d'autres sédentaires (Sodome et la Pentapole plutôt que les rois de Mésopotamie comme je l'avais cru tout d'abord). Comme dans les cunéiformes et les hiéroglyphes, le mot cesse d'être d'usage vivant au I^{er} millénaire. Jonas (i 9) est archaïsant et les textes du Deutéronome (xv 12) et de Jérémie (xxxiv 9, 14) sont en dépendance d'Ex. xxi 2. Ce cas est des plus intéressants car on y oppose l'esclave *'ibri* et l'esclave *'ôlam* (v. 6 cf. Deut. xv 17), c'est à dire l'esclave temporaire et l'esclave à perpétuité. *'ibri* semble donc avoir là une signification semblable à celle qu'il a dans les contrats de Nuzi où le *Habiru* est un étranger qui contracte un engagement de service temporaire. Quelque soit la date donnée aux textes bibliques, ils semblent supposer une situation analogue à celle des textes ci-dessus étudiés. On pense invinciblement à des gens qui sont „au delà” ou de passage. Ils ne sont pas établis de manière normale, mais peuvent être utilisés comme main d'oeuvre ou comme militaires par un gouvernement fort. Leur nationalité est de n'en point avoir, ils dépendent d'autres puissances et en Egypte font figure d'étrangers corvéables.

Pourquoi cette population flottante et en marge est elle notée avec un *p* à Ugarit et en Egypte, avec un *b* en hébreu et dans les cunéiformes tardifs? J'avais pensé que cela venait d'un emprunt à l'égyptien joint au désir d'éviter la prononciation *f*. Le P. DE VAUX avait fait remarquer la fragilité de l'hypothèse. C'est plutôt une question de particularité dialectale, analogue à celle de la vocalisation de *ubrum* dans le domaine cunéiforme. Peut-être pourrait on faire avancer la question en déterminant l'époque et le domaine de la spirantisation des *begadkephat*. On doit admettre avec CANTINEAU et MOSCATI que ce sont les mêmes phonèmes qui sont prononcés spirants ou non; mais avec HARRIS (*Dev. of the Can. Dialects*, p. 66) il semble qu'il faille admettre que la spirantisation a été connue très tôt en Ouest-sémitique. G. R. DRIVER a noté que dès le V^{ème} s. une série de noms ouest-sémitiques en *mèlek* étaient transcrits en *milhi* par les cunéiformes (*Aramaic Documents*, Oxford 1954, p. 32). Il faudra sans doute remonter beaucoup plus haut puisque Mr VIROLLEAUD a constaté que le *letek* hébreu s'écrivait *lth* à Ras Shamra. Ce qui est vrai du *kaph* doit l'être du *phe*. Le phonème indigène, hurrite ou sémitique, devait être une espèce de *v* ou de *f*. Le *'fr* sud-sémitique (CIH 570, 9) auquel CONTI-ROSSINI donne le sens de „temps” répondrait

assez à l'idée de „transitoire, passant”. Mr G. RYCKMANS me communique aimablement que ce sens paraît juste, mais qu'on manque d'autres exemples. En tous cas on conçoit bien qu'une sorte de *v* hébreu ait été un *p* à Ugarit et sur la côte.

Il ne semble pas cependant que nous soyons en état de déterminer le sens et l'étymologie. Peut-être pour les Israélites l'idée première fut elle celle de passage, d'instabilité, de transition. Chez les autres voisins de *Habiru* on a pu songer à d'autres étymologies. Nous n'oserions être aussi absolu que Mr LANDSBERGER qui rejette l'équivalence *ḥapiru-ʿibri* (p. 161). Que les *Habiru* soient des étrangers et des étrangers de passage, cela semble s'imposer, sans que ce soit nécessairement des étrangers qui passent la frontière; ce pourrait être plutôt une idée de nomadisme. De même je ne me rallierais qu'en partie à l'opinion de J.B. qui, rejetant le caractère ethnique des *Habiru*, y voit la désignation d'une condition sociale. Il semble bien que ce ne soit une unité ni raciale, ni ethnique, ni politique, mais que ce soit une certaine population flottante, passante, en marge; en marge des civilisations voisines, mais non sans rapports avec elles et susceptible de leur fournir de la main d'oeuvre, des militaires et même des officiers.

Cette réserve n'enlève rien à notre admiration pour ce travail remarquable dont on ne saurait trop louer la méthode. L'ampleur et la solidité de l'enquête, le soin de l'édition, la prudence des conclusions en font une oeuvre de premier plan qu'aucun bibliste ne pourra ignorer et qu'il aura de plus toujours plaisir à consulter.

Paris

H. CAZELLES

W. ZIMMERLI, *Erkenntnis Gottes nach dem Buche Ezechiel, eine theologische Studie*, ATANT Nr. 27, Zürich 1954. D.M. 8.50.

Der Verfasser beabsichtigt, durch eine Strukturuntersuchung zur besonders bei Ezechiel häufigen Formel: „und du wirst (ihr werdet, sie werden) erkennen, dass ich JHWH bin”, das „biblische Wort zur Frage der Gotteserkenntnis” zu beleuchten. Aus der Stellung dieser „Erkenntnis-aussage” (gew. am Schluss eines Abschnittes, um die Folgen des in ihm angekündigten göttlichen Handelns zu beschreiben), gehe hervor, dass Erkenntnis JHWH's ausschliesslich durch JHWH's Handeln zustande kommt und sich immer auf dieses Handeln bezieht. Es ist auffällig, dass Hosea und Jeremia statt Ezechiels Formulierung: (*kī*) *'anī JHWH*, immer einen einfachen Akkusativ bieten (ausgenommen in Jer. xxiv 7, wo beides kombiniert ist). Aus diesem Umstand folgert der Verfasser, dass Ez. seine Formulierung gewählt hat, um zu betonen, dass JHWH nie zum Objekt des *jd'* gemacht werden kann, sondern immer dessen Subjekt bleibt. Der Mensch kann ja nur um eine Offenbarung bitten; sie enthält die Ankündigung eines bestimmten göttlichen Handelns, und wenn dieses Handeln tatsächlich eintritt, bekommt der Mensch Erkenntnis JHWH's. Die Erkenntnis-aussage bestehe aus zwei heterogenen Elementen: das Erkenntnis-element *jd' kī* stamme aus der Welt des „Zeichengeschehens” (vgl. Gen. xlii 33f.), der Erkenntnisinhalt *'anī JHWH* aus der „Theophanierede”. Durch

diese, freilich ziemlich „schwerfällige“ Kombination, habe das *'ani* JHWH seine einseitig-sakrale Bedeutung abgestreift: JHWH offenbart sich auch in der Geschichte. Ez. habe erreichen wollen, dass das Volk und die Völker das Handeln JHWH's erkennen in der Begegnung mit dessen von seinen Boten in Vollmacht verkündigten Selbstmanifestation, die nicht nur das totale Urteil, sondern auch den neuen Anfang umfasst.

Bei aller Anerkennung für diese anregende Monographie, deren Inhalt hier natürlich nur sehr verkürzt und vergrößert skizziert werden konnte, müssen doch verschiedene Einwände erhoben werden.

Zunächst gibt es eine auffällige Diskrepanz zwischen Titel und Inhalt. Der Inhalt ist nicht ohne weiteres eine Untersuchung zur „Erkenntnis Gottes nach dem Buche Ez.“, sondern vornehmlich zum biblischen Zeugnis über die Erkenntnis Gottes, das beleuchtet werden soll durch Exegese, d.h. Strukturuntersuchung einer bestimmten Formel, die keineswegs ausschliesslich bei Ez. belegt ist, und zu deren Erklärung der Verf. sich weit mehr anderer Bibelbücher als des Buches Ez. bedient.

Die Hypothese über das Entstehen der fraglichen Erkenntnisaussage beruht auf einigen vielleicht nicht ganz gesicherten Voraussetzungen, z.B. einer bestimmten scharfen Trennung zwischen Prophet und Priester (der Prophet für das Volk, der Priester für den Einzelnen), und der Annahme, dass die Ausführungen von A. POEBEL (*Assyriol. St.* III, Chicago, 1932) wirklich widerlegt sind; die Frage, wo und wann die Elemente zusammengefügt wurden, wird nur mit einer unsicheren Vermutung beantwortet.

Gehört *jd' ki* wirklich so prononciert zum Bereich des „Zeichengeschehens“? *jd'* Qal wird im A.T. an ca 275 von den ca 800 Belegstellen mit *ki* konstruiert. (Vgl. auch eine Stelle wie C. GORDON, *Ugaritic Handbook* II, S. 138, III 8). Hos. und Jer. bevorzugen nicht nur wenn JHWH Objekt zu *jd'* ist die Konstruktion mit dem Akk. In Kap. xxv 14 und xxxviii 16 gebraucht Ez. die akkusativische Konstruktion indem JHWH und sein Handeln Objekt sind. Die kombinierte Konstruktion *jd' + Akk. + ki* von Jer. xxiv 7 ist auch belegt in Jer. ix 23, sowie in Ex. xxxii 22, Jos. iv 24, 2 Sam. iii 25, xvii 8, 1 Kön. v 17 und Ps. xciv 11.

Das Pron. *'ani* kommt sehr oft vor bei Ez., und zwar so gut wie ausschliesslich im Munde JHWH's (ausser den 72 Stellen in der Erkenntnisaussage noch 85 ×, wovon 20 × zusammen mit JHWH). Wäre also vielleicht für Ez. der Umstand, dass es JHWH ist, der handelt, wichtiger gewesen als das Handeln JHWH's an und für sich? Die Erkenntnisformel ist wohl elliptisch aufzufassen: und ihr werdet endlich euer Leben einrichten nach der Erkenntnis, dass ich, JHWH, JHWH bin. Keiner der Zeitgenossen Ezechiels zweifelte daran, dass JHWH dem Volke zum Gotte gewesen sei, man lehnte es jedoch ab, jetzt noch die Konsequenzen dieses Verhältnisses auf sich zu nehmen. Das Verhältnis Gott-Volk impliziert ja nicht nur, dass Gott dem Volke das Leben ermöglicht, sondern auch, dass das Volk dieses Leben dementsprechend einrichtet, nach Gottes Willen wandelt, anders gesagt: *jd' ki JHWH hū*. Trotz Priester, Propheten, Weiser, *mišpātim* und *huqqōt* sträubte das Volk sich gegen diese Lebenshaltung. Wenn deswegen schliesslich das Urteil einen grossen Teil der Bevölkerung betroffen hat,

glaubt man, JHWH habe das Volk verlassen, und fängt an, andere Götter zu verehren. Dann aber muss der Prophet das radikale Urteil ankündigen: der Tod, in dem das Volk sich schon befindet, wird jetzt ganz realisiert. Die wenigen Übriggebliebenen sind nur da, damit sie entweder selber die Gerechtigkeit des Urteils anerkennen oder, wenn nicht, durch ihr Benehmen den Völkern zeigen, dass JHWH richtig gehandelt hat. Zum Anschauen der ganzen Welt hat JHWH ja sein Volk erwählt, hat dieses Volk JHWH's Namen entweiht und JHWH das Volk ins Verderben gestürzt. Die Umwelt interpretiert JHWH's Handeln jedoch ebenso falsch wie früher Israel; sie ist nicht bereit zu *jd' ké JHWH bú*, und sein heiliger Name bleibt profaniert. Dann belebt JHWH, der nicht ohne Volk sein will, sein Volk — und zwar ausschliesslich wegen seines heiligen Namens — und schenkt ihnen einen neuen Geist; dann werden sie wirklich *jd' ké 'nî JHWH*.

Leiden

TH. SPREY

BOOK LIST ¹⁾

Ancient Near Eastern Texts, relating to the Old Testament, ed. by J. B. PRITCHARD, second edition, revised and enlarged, Princeton University Press, 1955. xxi + 544 pp. \$ 17.50.

La Bible et l'Orient, travaux du premier congrès français d'archéologie et d'orientalisme bibliques, Paris, Presses universitaires de France, 1955. Contributions de H. CAZELLES, E. DHORME, E. DRIOTON, A. DUPONT-SOMMER, E. JACOB, C. JEAN, M. LAMBERT et A. PARROT.

Bijbels Woordenboek, Afl. 2, Egypte-Isaak. Ed. A. VAN DEN BORN, 2nd ed., Roermond en Maaseik, 1955.

Le problème biblique dans le Protestantisme, par J. BOISSET, M. GOGUEL, P. LES-TRINGANT, E. JACOB, W. EICHRODT, Paris, Presses universitaires de France, 1955. Particulièrement intéressants l'article sur l'autorité canonique de l'A.T. et les Rapports du Nouveau et de l'A.T.

The Hebrew Union College Annual. While the supply lasts, the *HUCA* will be glad to send gratis upon request a booklet containing tables of contents of Vol. I through Vol. XXIV. Kindly address: Prof. S. H. BLANK, ed., 3101 Clifton Ave., Cincinnati 20, Ohio, U.S.A.

The Idea of History in the Ancient Near East, ed. R. C. DENTAN. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press, 1955. ix + 376 p. \$ 5.00.

Contributors R. H. BAINTON, L. BULL, M. BURROWS, G. G. CAMERON, E. DINKLER, J. OBERMANN, P. SCHUBERT, E. A. SPEISER, C. BRADFORD WELLES. *Moïse, l'homme de l'alliance*, par H. CAZELLES, A. GÉLIN, B. BOTTE, G. VERMÈS, R. BLOCH. Paris, Desclée 1955. 405 p.

Etudes sur la manière dont le personnage de Moïse a été compris à différents âges et dans différents milieux.

HARRIS BIRKELAND, *The evildoers in the Book of Psalms*, Oslo, Dybwad, 1955. 96 p. S. H. BLANK, "Of a Truth the Lord hath sent me". An inquiry into the source of the Prophet's authority. The Goldenson Lecture for 1955. Cincinnati, 1955. 17 p.

P. A. H. DE BOER, *Gods beloften over land en volk in het Oude Testament* (series „Libertatis Ergo" n^o. 4), Delft, W. Gaade N.V., 1955. 60 pp.

¹⁾ The mention of books in this list neither implies nor precludes subsequent review at length.

- J. GRAY, *The Krt text in the literature of Ras Shamra*. A social myth of ancient Canaan. Leiden, Brill, 1955. ix + 66 p. Dutch fl. 10.—.
- M. GREENBERG, *The Hab/piru*, American Oriental Society, New Haven, Conn., 1955. xiii + 96 p. \$ 3.50.
- C. TRESMONTANT, *Etudes de métaphysique biblique*, Paris, Gabalda, 1955. 263 p. Etude intéressante qui, sans être de l'exégèse proprement dite, peut permettre à des esprits philosophiques contemporains d'accéder à l'intelligence du texte biblique.
- E. DE VAUMAS, *Le Liban* (Montagne libanaise, Bekaa, Anti-Liban, Hermon, Haute Galilée libanaise). Etude de géographie physique. I. Texte 360 p. II. Planches. III. Album de photographies. Paris, Firmin Didot 1954.
Cet ouvrage considérable, pourvu de nombreuses cartes et cent vingt et une planches de photographies commentées, intéressera le bibliste non seulement à cause de ses études sur l'Hermon, la Bekaa et la Haute Galilée, régions solidaires du territoire biblique, mais également par ses précieux aperçus sur la végétation; l'auteur a cherché à préciser l'état de la végétation dans l'antiquité; il conclut en particulier que le 'erez (malheureusement transcrit éréz) est bien le cèdre, mais que le *berosch* est non le cyprès, mais le génévrier.
- M. ZUCKER, *A critique against the writings of r. Saadya Gaon by r. Mubashshir Halevi*. New York, Ph. Feldheim, 381 Grand Street. 130 p. \$ 3.50. In Hebrew.

INDEXES

GENERAL

- ʿAbdiheba (of Jerusalem) 319
 Abibaal (of Tyre) 67
 Abraham ibn Daud 329
 Absalom, House of 121
 Abu ʿIsa of Iṣfahan 331
 Accadian 14, 89, 155s., 204, 227, 229,
 310, 312, 342, 403, 422, 434
 Aelian 87
 Aḥab 70
 Aḥiqar (Wisdom of) 84, 87
 Aḥiram (Inscr. of) 437
 Ahura Mazda 137, 139ss., 144, 146
 Akiba (R.) 270
 Alalakh (Texts of) 441, 443
 Alexander the Great 305
 Alexander Jannai 108, 123
 Alexandra Salome 123
 Alphabet 100
 Amarna letters 6s., 22, 204, 229, 319,
 441ss.
 Amaziah (of Israel) 70
 Amaziah (of Judah) 71
 Amenophis ii 443
 Amenophis iii 6
 Amenophis iv 6s.
 Amon (god) 85s.
 Anan (Karaite) 329, 331, 333
 Anat (Goddess) 15
 Angra Mainyu 137, 139ss., 146
 Antiochus iv Epiphanes 116, 273, 276,
 402
 Aqht 312, 422s.
 Aquila 155s., 158, 161, 196, 199, 343
 Arabic 154ss., 159, 217, 219, 222, 281,
 309ss., 337ss., 421s.
 Aramaic 52, 155, 161, 181, 214ss.,
 274ss., 280s., 288, 309ss., 339, 341,
 352s., 422, 437
 Arawna (the Jebusite) 318ss.
 Archaeology 93ss., 97ss.
 Aristobulos ii 117s., 123, 128
 Arms 232ss., 357ss., 403s.
 Army 353ss., 402, 405s., 408, 415
 Arrian 359
 Artaxerxes i 263, 294
 Artaxerxes ii 294
 Asclepiodotus 415
 Asher b. Jehiel (R.) 288
 Atonement, (Day of) 58, 75, 252, 255
 Azitawaddu (inscr. of) 435
 Baʿal 24s., 28
 Bagothi 262ss.
 Barnabas (Epistle of) 107
 Basilus 191
 Bašyatshi, Elijah 302, 334
 Ben Sira (wisdom of) 150, 152, 159,
 212, 277, 279, 281, 315ss., 346, 352ss.,
 358, 400, 411, 413ss., 418, 430
 Beth Shemesh 98
 Boethusians 52, 329
 Bukhari 154
 Bull images 70
 Calendar 34ss., 251s., 259s., 328
 —, Ass. & Bab. 38s.
 —, Pentecontad 37ss., 321
 —, Solar 67ss.
 Canaanite 203s.
 Cappadocian Texts 37, 131
 Causality 1ss.
 Chanukka 52s.
 Cicero 116
 Consecutive Tense Construction 180ss.
 Covenant 56
 Creation 139, 141s.
 Curtius, Quintus 87
 Damascus Document (CDC) 55, 77,
 106s., 114, 116, 118, 120, 126s., 148ss.,
 196ss., 280, 284ss., 331, 350s., 353,
 368, 370s., 406, 418, 436
 Daniel 272ss.
 Daniel al-Qumisi 333
 Darius i 63
 Darius ii 263s.

- David 1, 8s., 11s., 18ss., 28, 32, 40, 66, 68, 93s., 99
 David Mokammes (Karaite) 331
 Davidic Dynasty 81s.
 Dead Sea Scrolls 34, 65, 105ss., 284ss.
 — (DSD) 77ss., 105ss., 114, 120, 127, 137ss., 174, 277, 280, 292, 301, 315ss., 338, 350ss., 364, 367, 373ss., 393s., 413s., 418
 — (DSH) 105ss., 113ss., 148ss., 174, 178, 246, 307, 346, 374, 411
 — (DSIa) 152, 168, 180ss., 189ss., 207s., 244ss., 306ss.
 — (DSIb) 187
 — (DS Psalms) 120, 140, 277ss., 348ss., 364, 374, 411, 418
 — (DS Psalm Commentary Fragm.) 306
 — (DSW) 277, 307, 345ss., 373ss.
 Demonstrative particle 309ss.
 Deutero-Isaiah 20, 25, 31s.
 Deuteronomy 258ss., 373
 Didache 107
 Diodorus 321
 Diodorus of Sicily 128
 Diogenes Laertius 190ss.
 Divorce 288, 334
 Duppi-Teshup 3
- Ebionites 330
 El 15, 70, 132
 El Shaddai 131
 Elephantine Papyri 83ss., 229, 250ss., 288, 334, 402
 Elijah 78, 80s.
 Eliezer (son of Moses) 134s.
 Eliezer (Pirqe of R.) 52, 148, 430
 Eliezer (R.) 53, 269
 Enoch (Book of) 34, 37, 55, 57, 59s., 63, 119, 409, 412
 Enthronement Psalms 20
 Ephraim Syrus 395
 Epiphanius 51, 192, 194
 Eshnunna (Code of) 321
 Essenes 49, 51, 105ss., 145, 292, 330s., 367
 Eth-nominativi 314s.
 Ethiopic 155, 221
 Ethiopic Version 158
 Eudemus of Rhodes 138
 Eudoxus of Cnide 138
 Euseby 49s.
 Eye (pharao) 7
- Exegetes (Jew.-Arabic) 337, 340, 342
 Ezriq of Kolb 145s.
 iii Ezra 291
- Falashas 51
 Father (God of my) 130ss.
- Galileans 49ss., 54ss., 64s., 76
 Gamaliel (R.) 270
 Gellius 190
 Gilgamesh (Epos of) 227
 Gnosticism 148, 150
 Gregory of Nazianz 191
- Habiru 440ss.
 Hammurabi (Code of) 321
 Hassidim 106
 Hattushili iii 3ss., 442
 Hebrew, post-biblical 89, 180s., 279, 286, 309, 401, 403s., 408, 410
 Hegesippus 49
 Hermas, Shepherd of 107
 Herod 95s.
 Herod Agrippa 96
 Herodote 87, 264
 Hexapla 199
 Hezekiah 19, 94s., 103
 High priest 78, 81s., 396
 Hiram (of Tyre) 67s.
 Historiography (Hittite) 1ss.
 — (Isr.) 1ss.
 Hittite 318ss.
 Hittites 441s.
 Holiness Code 74
 Hurrite 319
 Hyrcan ii 117ss., 122s., 125, 127s.
- Ibn-al-Hiti 334
 Ibn-Barun 309
 Ibn Ezra 91, 155, 200s., 288, 291, 299, 306, 329, 332
 Ibn Qurajsh 337
 Ibn Sa'ad 339
 Ilias 234, 358
 Incubation 426s.
 Inscriptions, Aramaic 104s., 230
 —, Hittite 131s.
 —, Nabatean 131
 —, Palmyrenean 131
 —, Phoenician 217, 434ss., 437
- Jehuda ibn Balam (R.) 334
 Jerobeam i 70

- Jerome 155s., 196, 199s., 273
 Jerusalem 93ss.
 Jethro 134
 Jezebel 70
 Joash (of Israel) 71
 Joĥanan (high priest) 262ss.
 Jochebed 135
 Jose b. Halafta (R.) 299
 Josephus 52, 67, 87, 93, 95, 115, 128,
 145, 318, 321, 398
 Joshua (R.) 270, 433
 Joshua b. Levi 52s.
 Josiah (of Judah) 5, 71, 81, 102
 Jubilee 321ss.
 Jubilees (Book of) 34ss., 302, 321
 Judah Halevi 329
 Judas the Maccabee 108, 306
 Judgment, Last 196s., 369
 Judith (Book of) 299s., 398
 Jussiv 230s.
- Karaites** 76, 302s., 328ss.
Kashtiliash (of Babylon) 27
Kenite hypothesis 131, 134
Keret 132, 227, 313, 421s.
King 225ss.
King Psalms 18
Ķirkisani 302s., 328
Kittim 105s., 115s., 158, 393ss., 412,
 416, 418ss.
Knowledge of God 445ss.
Ķorban 324
- Lachish** 97ss.
Lachish Letters 102s., 217, 229, 438
Levi (tribe) 323
Lexicography 214ss., 337ss., 345ss.,
 436ss.
Life 225ss.
Lucianic tradition 155, 207s.
- Maccabees** 398
i Maccabees 80s., 116, 286, 395, 399s., 407
ii Maccabees 417, 419
Macrobius 87
Maimonides 288, 329
Manasse (of Judah) 95
Manicheism 146, 413
Marduk 3
Marduk-zākir-shumi i 9
Mari texts 18, 131, 441
Maššot 40s., 43, 49s., 52, 58s., 72, 74,
 251, 255s., 259s., 324
- Mattiwaza of Mitanni** 4
Mazdeism 144
Megillah 286
Mekhilta 81, 282
Melcarth 68s.
Menelaus (high priest) 127
Messiah 77ss., 107, 148, 150, 161, 194,
 196, 302, 305ss., 366ss.
Michael (Archangel) 409, 413
Midrash 53, 63, 113, 148, 151, 157, 159,
 289, 306s., 423s., 429, 431
Mithra 137
Moses 133ss.
Môt 24
Muqaddasi 46
Murabba'at (documents of) 125ss.
Murshili ii 1ss., 9
Muwatalli 3
Mysticism 326ss.
- Nabatean** 311
Nahawandi, Benjamin 333
Nahmanides 329
Names 217s., 318ss.
Nebuchadnezzar 98, 100, 103
Nehemiah 96s.
New Moon Day 37
New Year Day 17, 24, 41s., 44, 46, 49,
 58, 63, 65, 70s., 73, 75, 268
Nuzi texts 321, 441s.
- Onias iii** 127
Origen 207s.
Ostraca 260
Ostraca, Samaritan 217
- Passover** 50ss., 57ss., 64, 71s., 74, 250ss.,
 324
Pentateuch criticism 250ss.
Pentecost 41s., 44s., 51ss., 56s., 72,
 74
Peshiṭta 89, 91, 152ss., 158, 165, 168,
 178s., 199, 202, 221, 279, 314, 316,
 343, 437
Pesiṭta 289, 307
Pharisees 49, 80, 329
Philo 50, 321, 429s.
Phoenician 309
Piyyuṭ 277
Plato 190ss., 415
Plutarch 87, 116, 137s., 140, 142ss.
Pompey 116s., 128s.
Posidonius 415

- Priest, unfaithful 117ss., 123, 128s., 150
 Priestly Code 53, 55s., 63, 65, 75
 Prophets 20, 78ss.
 Psalm investigation 13ss.
 Psalms (non-Isr.) 21s., 25s.
 Psalms of Solomon 106s., 331
 Psychology (Hebrew) 421ss.
 Ptolemy iv Philopator 50
 Ptolemy vi Philometor 273
- Q**
 Qastallani 154
 Qimhi (R. David) 91, 200ss., 206
 Qur'an 425s.
- R**
 Ramses ii 3ss., 27, 443
 Ramses iii 404, 443
 Ramses iv 443
 Rashi 89, 91, 155, 200s., 266, 288, 291, 296, 299
 Rashi (Pseudo-) 299
 Rehoboam 99
 Reliefs (Palmyrenean) 358
- S**
 Saadiah 160, 239, 331
 Sabbath 255
 Sabbatical year 74, 322, 397
 Sadducees 49, 80, 302, 329s.
 Safaitic 311
 Sahidic Version 154
 Samaritan Pentateuch 133, 288, 321, 347
 Samaritans 49, 70, 76, 299s., 302s.
 Samuel ibn Djâmi 329
 Sanaballat 263
 Šapattum 38ss., 49, 58, 72
 Sapientia Salomonis 419
 Šaphon 24s., 27
 Sarial (archangel) 409
 Saul 3, 8, 10s., 28
 Scaurus, M. Aemilius 117
 Sebuacans 51
 Seleucides 394, 402
 Sennacherib 99ss., 103
 Septuagint 10, 89s., 152s., 155s., 158ss., 164, 166ss., 174s., 179, 199, 202, 206ss., 208ss., 221, 223, 288, 291ss., 298, 313, 317s., 321, 325, 343, 350, 369s., 395, 403, 422, 436s.
 Servant of the Lord 369, 372
 Sethi i 443
 Shamshi-Adad v 9
 Shemoneh-Ešreh 107
 Shishak 99
- S**
 Shunashshura 3
 Shuppiluliuma 2ss.
 Siloam tunnel 94
 Simon the Maccabee 80
 Sleep 421ss.
 Solomon 66, 68s., 94, 96
 Storm-god 2
 Stratoniceus 190
 Sukkot 39, 52s., 58, 72, 251, 267ss.
 Sungod 68s.
 Symmachus 154s., 161, 199, 343, 424
 Synagogue 73
 Syriac 281, 339, 343, 364, 395, 415, 417, 422
 Syro Hexapla 155, 199
- T**
 Tabernacles, Feast of 17
 Talmud 9, 52, 65, 81, 92, 161, 255, 268ss., 281, 286, 289, 294, 299, 306s., 424, 433
 Targum 85, 89, 148, 152ss., 157s., 161, 199s., 202, 206, 228, 279, 288, 296, 299, 343, 370, 413, 424
 Teacher of Righteousness 106, 108s., 117ss., 121, 123ss., 157, 279, 294, 303s., 307, 368
 Temple 67ss.
 Temple, Second 74s.
 Temple music 19
 Testament of the xii Patriarchs 105, 107ss., 288, 315, 318, 412
 Theodotion 155, 161, 196, 343, 437
 Theopompus 138
 Therapeutaeans (sect of) 50s.
 Tobit (book of) 212, 419
 Tombs 101s.
 Tosefta 125, 288, 292, 297, 362
 Tradition (rabbinic) 57
 Tukulti Ninurta i 27
 Tutankhamon 6
 Tuthmoses iii 443
 Tyre 67ss.
- U**
 Ugaritic Texts 13ss., 66, 70, 88, 132, 204, 216s., 219, 312s., 421ss., 438, 441ss., 446
- V**
 Vocalization, Palestinian 186
 Vulgate 152s., 155s., 158, 160, 233, 291, 321, 343
- X**
 X-Sign in DSIa 189ss.
 Xenophon 415

- Yudgan 331
 Zadokites 329s.
 Zedekiah (of Judah) 103
 Zervanites 137ss.
 Zoroaster 137

AUTHORS CITED

- Åbel, F. M. 10, 91, 94
 Adler-Seligsohn 300
 Aharoni, I. 6
 Ahrens, K. 425
 Ajjalón, D. 338s., 343s.
 Albright, W. F. 13s., 18s., 23, 26ss.,
 31ss., 68, 97, 99ss., 130, 163, 203,
 311, 325
 Alfasi 288
 Allegro, J. M. 306, 309ss., 373
 Alt, A. 130ss., 135, 263, 326
 André, T. 254
 Aptowitz, A. 77, 81
 Auerbach, E. 11
 Augusti 233
 Auvray, P. 239, 241
 Baer, S. 202
 Baethgen, Fr. 18, 203, 267
 Ball, C. J. 422
 Balscheit 10
 Barclay 95
 Bardtke, H. 245, 404
 Barnes 168, 203
 Barnett, D. 105
 Barnhart, C. L. 176
 Barns, J. W. B. 148, 151s.
 Baron, S. W. 334
 Barrois, A. G. 260, 403
 Barth, J. 309, 338
 Barthélemy, A. 157, 338ss., 342ss.
 —, D. 367, 373, 393
 Basnage 332
 Batten 260
 v. Baudissin, W. W. 226
 Bauer, H. 9
 —, L. 338, 340ss.
 Bauer-Leander 228, 281, 311, 340
 Baumann 310
 Baumgartner, W. 20, 85, 214ss.
 Baumstark 47
 Beaussier, M. 338, 341, 343
 Beer, G. 166, 169s., 231, 256
 Begrich, J. 9, 15s., 18, 21, 239s.
 Behrmann 275
 Bell, R. 425
 Ben-Jehuda, E. 88, 159, 338ss.
 Bentzen, A. 18, 239
 Benveniste, E. 138s., 143ss.
 Benzinger, I. 404
 Bergsträsser, G. 340
 Bertholet, A. 251s.
 Beurlier, E. 359
 Bewer, J. A. 222, 239
 Bezold, C. 403, 434
 Bič, M. 434
 Bickell, G. 395
 Bidez, F. 137, 143s.
 Bikerman, E. 402
 Bilabel 3
 Birkeland, H. 17, 312
 Black, M. 160s.
 Blau 288
 —, J. 314, 337ss.
 Bliss 94s.
 Bo Reicke 106
 Böhl, Fr. 22
 de Boer, P. A. H. 163, 222, 225ss., 247
 Böttcher 310
 Bomberg, D. 334
 Bonsirven, J. 129, 255, 412
 Borée, W. 218
 Borger, R. 434
 Bottéro, J. 440ss.
 Bouché-Leclercq 273
 Boylan 203
 Brekelmans, Chr. H. W. 134
 Briggs, C. A. 203
 Bright, J. 326
 Brockelmann, C. 216, 309, 339, 341ss.
 Brown, Fr. 199s., 202s.
 Brown-Driver-Briggs 89, 159, 163ss.,
 173, 177s., 203, 214, 216, 287, 290,
 338ss., 439
 Brownlee, W. H. 78s., 123s., 178, 246,
 291, 367
 Brun, J. 417
 Bruno, A. 239s.
 Buchanan, B. W. 101
 Budde, K. 233, 239, 242
 Buhl, Fr. 204
 Burrows, M. 77ss., 93ss., 139, 150, 180,
 279s., 436
 Bustani, B. 338, 340, 342ss.

- Buttenwieser, M. 13ss., 266, 268
 Buttrick, G. A. 324
 Buxtorf, J. 329

 Caird, G. B. 9, 326
 Calvin, J. 88, 199s., 202
 Canaan, T. 45, 322
 Canney, M. A. 163s., 167
 Cantineau, J. 216, 444
 Caquot, A. 87
 Carcopino, J. 116
 Carmignac, J. 345ss., 420
 Carpzovius, J. B. 329
 Caspari, W. 239
 Cassin, Mlle 441
 Cassuto, M. D. U. 1, 25, 28
 Cavaignac, E. 6, 8, 284
 Cazelles, H. 205, 252, 255s., 263, 265,
 321ss., 324ss., 334, 440ss.
 Chamberlain, J. V. 366ss.
 Chapman 255
 Charles, R. H. 37, 87, 108, 368, 409,
 412, 436
 Cheyne, T. K. 88, 168, 199s., 202
 Christensen, A. 144
 Chwolson, D. 329, 332, 334
 Clemen, C. 137
 Clericus, J. 233
 Clermont-Ganneau 264
 Conder, C. R. 97
 Conti-Rossini, K. 444
 Cook, S. A. 216
 Cooke, G. A. 216, 251s., 291, 311,
 434s.
 Coppins, J. 22, 25
 Cornill, C. H. 18
 Couroyer, B. 83ss., 256
 Cowley, A. 83s., 229, 250, 255, 258,
 260, 402
 Cumming, C. 21
 Cumont, F. 137, 143s.

 Dahood, M. 437
 Dahse 315
 Dalman, G. 45, 93, 214, 344
 Daremberg 359s.
 Dathe, J. A. 201s.
 David, M. 442
 Davidson, A. B. 230, 432
 Davies, W. D. 367, 369
 Deissmann 208
 Delcor, M. 154, 340, 346ss., 351ss., 357,
 361ss., 375, 400, 411

 Delitzsch, Franz 200, 203, 339
 —, Friedrich 309, 442
 Dhorme, E. 440, 443
 —, P. 233
 Diringer, D. 97ss.
 Dobbie, R. 199ss.
 Dossin, G. 131
 Dozy, R. 338ss., 343s., 403
 Drioton, E. 86
 Driver, G. R. 83, 85, 136, 255, 264, 284,
 304, 309, 340s., 437, 444
 —, S. R. 169, 183ss., 220, 254, 275,
 309, 315
 Dubnow, S. 332
 Duhm, B. 15, 18, 88s., 168s., 200ss.,
 239, 241s.
 Dupont-Sommer, A. 104, 105ss., 113ss.,
 157, 259s., 307, 330, 356, 405
 Dussaud, R. 22

 Ebers, G. 151
 Edel 6
 Ehrlich, A. B. 199, 201s.
 —, E. L. 426, 431
 Eichhorn. 201s.
 Eilers 321
 Eissfeldt, O. 232ss., 241, 252, 256
 Eitan 310, 312
 Elliger, K. 113ss., 117ss., 127ss., 153s.,
 157s.
 Epstein, A. 50s.
 Erman, A. 257, 264
 Ewald, H. 15, 88, 199, 201s., 232,
 310

 Fairman, 152
 Février, J. G. 361, 374
 Field, H. 196
 Finkelstein 68, 441
 Fischer, J. 239
 Fleischer 309
 Fohrer, G. 239ss., 251
 Forrer 3ss.
 Fränkel, S. 425
 de Fraine, J. 227
 Franken, H. J. 326ss.
 Frankenberg, W. 164s., 173
 Frazer, J. G. 269, 428
 Friedlander 52
 Friedmann 289, 307
 Friedrich, J. 2s., 320
 Fürst, J. 219
 Furlani 1

- Gadd, C. J. 131
 Gaennsle, C. 309
 Galling, K. 104, 229, 241, 252, 260
 Gaster, Th. H. 3
 Gauthier 87
 Geers, W. F. 3
 Gehman, H. S. 208
 Geiger 187, 302, 329
 Gélin, A. 91, 260
 Gesenius, W. 200, 202, 310
 Gesenius-Buhl 116, 214ss., 235s., 338ss., 352, 357, 393, 412
 Gesenius-Kautzsch 154, 221, 230, 340
 Gesenius-Kautzsch-Cowley 183, 185, 288, 290, 311
 Ginsberg, H. L. 23, 26, 28, 31, 57, 103, 132, 259, 272ss., 312
 Ginzberg, L. 77s., 80s., 158, 424, 433
 Goetze, A. 1ss., 8s., 441
 Goodspeed, E. J. 164
 Gordis, R. 88ss., 180
 Gordon, A. R. 164s., 171s., 174, 177s.
 —, C. H. 26, 132, 204, 233, 312, 435, 438, 446
 Gottstein, M. H. 153, 291
 Graetz, H. 332, 334
 Grant 45, 99
 Grapow, H. 152
 Gray, G. B. 169
 Grelot, P. 250ss.
 Gressmann, H. 107, 239s., 259
 Grimme, H. 311s.
 Grossberg 288
 Grotius, H. 199ss.
 Güterbock, H. G. 1, 4s.
 Gunkel, H. 15ss., 23, 25, 27, 203, 228, 267, 271
 Gur 222
 Gurney, O. R. 4
 Guthe, E. 248

 de Haas, W. P. 154
 Habermann, A. M. 125, 153s., 157, 280
 Hadasi 302
 Haller, M. 239s., 242
 Hamilton 96
 Harding, L. 98
 Harkavy 302, 329
 Harkawy 288
 Harper 309
 —, W. R. 89, 166, 199ss.
 Harris, Z. S. 310, 434, 444
 Hastings 47, 50

 Hava 338ss.
 Heinisch, P. 323s.
 Hempel, J. 230, 246
 Henderson 200ss.
 Hennequin 259
 Hildesheimer 288
 Hinneberg, P. 15
 Hirschfeld, H. 333
 Hitzig 200, 202
 Höpfner 233
 Hommel, F. 309
 Honeyman, A. M. 214ss.
 v. Hoonacker 259
 Horn, S. H. 257, 260
 Horowitz 288
 Horst, F. 91
 Horton 199s., 202
 Hrozný 319
 Humbert, P. 395
 Hunzinger 420
 Hvidberg, Fl. Fr. 24
 Hyatt, J. Ph. 130ss.

 Inge, Ch. H. 98

 Jamme, A. 104
 Jastrow, M. 401, 404
 Jaubert, A. 34, 60, 62
 Jellinek, A. 306s.
 Jenni, E. 226
 Jeremias, J. 241
 Jirku, A. 22, 203s.
 Johnson, A. R. 20, 226, 326ss.
 de Jonge, M. 108
 Joüon, P. 126, 230, 349, 363
 Jung, P. 152
 Junge, E. 407

 Kahle, P. 186, 246, 337ss.
 Kampffmeyer, G. 338ss.
 Kapelrud, A. S. 24
 Kaufmann, Y. 11
 Kautzsch, E. 203, 239, 248
 Kautzsch-Bertholet 91
 Keil, C. F. 200, 202
 Kelly, F. T. 184
 Kennicott 201, 347
 Kienitz, F. K. 149
 King 3
 Kirchheim 302
 Kittel, R. 11, 130, 166, 173, 178, 203, 219, 223, 231, 235, 267
 Klostermann, A. 232

- Knudtzon, J. A. 319
 Koehler, L. 156, 159, 163ss., 173, 175, 177s., 181, 205, 235s., 239ss., 275
 Koehler-Baumgartner 89, 200, 214ss., 338ss., 352, 357
 König, E. 214ss., 239, 310, 340
 Kohler, K. 328
 Kopf, L. 337
 Korošec 4s., 8
 Kraeling, E. G. 83s., 87, 260, 264
 Kraetzschmar 9, 309
 Krauss, S. 404
 Kroner 9
 Kuhl, C. 245

 Labuschagne, C. J. 312s.
 Lacheman 442
 de Lagarde, P. 155, 413
 Lagrange, M. J. 328, 330
 Lambert, M. 154, 183
 Lamon 104
 Lampronti 288
 v. 't Land, F. A. W. 153s.
 de Landberg, C. 154, 337ss., 342ss.
 Landsberger, B. 85, 440s., 443, 445
 de Langhe, R. 14s.
 Laroche, E. 132
 Lauterbach, J. Z. 80
 Lecerf, A. 254
 Lefebvre, G. 86
 Lehmann, J. 331
 Leslie 130
 Leszynsky, R. 330
 Lewy, H. 35, 37ss., 41, 44, 47s., 50s., 54s., 321s., 442
 —, J. 35, 37ss., 41, 44, 47s., 50s., 54s., 131, 321s., 440, 442
 Lévy 85
 Liddell & Scott 192, 223, 415
 Lidzbarski, M. 216, 230, 437
 Liebermann, S. 197s.
 Lindblom, J. 245
 Lipschütz, I. 270
 Littmann, E. 311
 Lods, A. 254
 Löfgren 158
 Loewenstamm, S. A. 340
 Loewinger, S. 249
 Luther, M. 199s., 202
 Luzzato, S. D. 187

 Maag, V. 219
 Maclean 47

 Maisler, B. 1, 11, 320
 Malamat, A. 1ss.
 Malecki, P. 332
 Mandelkern, S. 219
 Margalioth 157
 Margoliouth, D. S. 429
 —, G. 335
 Marsh, J. 325
 Marti, K. 91, 168, 177, 201s., 239, 242
 Martin, W. J. 152
 Martinus, R. 329
 Maurer 201s.
 May, H. G. 132s.
 Mayer 96
 Mayser, E. 209, 211
 del Medico, H. E. 131s.
 Meek, T. J. 70, 135, 442
 Meissner, B. 442
 Mendenhall, G. E. 131
 Messel, N. 239
 Meyer, E. 3, 107, 149s.
 —, G. 3s.
 Michaelis, J. D. 200s.
 —, J. H. 233
 Michaud, H. 137ss., 356
 Michelet, S. 239
 Micklem, N. 324
 Milik, J. T. 78s., 345, 373
 Militante, P. Th. 190
 Moffatt, J. 50, 199s., 202
 Molin, G. 407
 Montgomery, J. A. 221, 275, 413
 Moore, G. F. 55, 184
 Moraldi 325
 Morgenstern, J. 34ss.
 Moscati, S. 444
 Moulton, J. H. 208
 Mowinckel, S. 13ss., 239ss.
 Mühlau 309
 Müller, M. 443
 Muilenburg, J. 435
 Murray, M. A. 97ss.
 Muss-Arnolt 434
 Myers, F. W. H. 431
 —, J. 326

 Nachtigal, J. C. 233
 Nagel, G. 26
 Nemoy, L. 302, 328ss.
 Neubauer, A. 299
 Neuman 332
 Neumark, D. 151
 Nicomodi 302

- Niemojewski, A. 332
 Nöldeke, Th. 219, 342s., 415
 Nötscher, F. 91
 North, C. R. 239
 —, R. 204ss., 321ss.
 Noth, M. 91, 217, 221, 247, 325s.
 Nougayrol 441s.
 Nowack, W. 9, 89, 200ss., 267
 Nyberg, H. S. 138, 144ss., 311, 402
 Obermann, J. 136, 436
 O'Callaghan, R. T. 88s.
 Oesterley, W. O. E. 164ss., 170, 172ss.,
 176, 239
 Oettli 201s.
 Olshausen 310
 Oort 89
 Orelli 199, 201
 Orlinsky, H. 207
 Patai, R. 227, 269
 Paterson 10
 Patton, J. H. 22, 25
 Pauly-Wissowa 319
 Payne-Smith, J. 395
 Pedersen, J. 12, 32, 228s., 326
 Peringer, G. 331
 Perles, F. 352
 Perowne 203
 Petrie, W. M. F. 97, 104
 Petuchowski, J. J. 266ss.
 Pfeiffer, R. H. 15, 134
 Philippi 310
 Pierret 86
 Pinsker, L. 329
 v. d. Ploeg, J. 373ss.
 Poebel, A. 446
 Posener, G. 443
 Poznanski, S. 328, 330, 334, 343
 Prätorius, F. 239, 241
 Pritchard, J. B. 2, 132, 259
 Procksch, O. 178, 200ss.
 Puech, H. Ch. 318
 Pusey 199s., 202
 Quispel, G. 318
 Rabin, Ch. 118, 127, 148ss., 289, 291,
 295s., 301, 305, 307, 309, 311
 Rabinowitz, I. 79, 106, 115s., 126s., 157,
 285ss., 289ss., 301ss.
 v. Rad, G. 326
 Rahlfs, A. 152
 Ranke, H. 257
 Rathjens 51
 Reckendorf, H. 310
 Reider, J. 83
 Reinach, A. 360
 Reisner 442
 Renan, E. 330, 332
 Richardson, H. N. 163ss., 434ss.
 Ridderbos, J. 239
 Risdon, D. L. 102
 Robinson, E. 95s.
 —, H. W. 428
 —, Th. H. 89, 200, 202, 239
 Rochester, S. of 199, 201s.
 Rohde, E. 428
 Rosén, H. B. 318ss.
 de Rossi, J. B. 201, 334
 Rost, L. 295, 374, 397
 Rowley, H. H. 13, 77, 105, 130, 272ss.,
 285, 289, 292s., 303, 305, 307s., 368,
 373
 Rubinstein, A. 180ss.
 Rudolph, W. 252, 260
 Ryckmans, G. 445
 de Sacy, S. 329
 Saglio 359s.
 Schaeffer, Cl. 358
 Scharff 86
 Schechter, S. 107, 284, 289s., 302s., 305,
 333, 406
 Schlachter 173
 Schlossberg 288
 Schmidt, H. 266, 338ss.
 Schoeps, H. J. 107, 330s.
 Scholem, G. 151
 Schürer, E. 396
 Seeligmann, I. L. 206ss.
 Segal, M. H. 125, 158s., 180, 309, 410
 —, M. Z. 277, 316s.
 Seidel, M. 90
 Sellin, E. 89, 91, 200, 202s.
 Semkowski, L. 437
 Senensis, S. 189ss.
 Seyrig, H. 358
 Shipton 104
 Sievers 26
 Silberman, L. H. 77ss.
 Simon, U. E. 239
 Simons, J. 93ss.
 Simson 200ss.
 Sinar, P. 338
 Sinclair, L. 101

- Singer, A. D. 340s.
 Sizoo, J. 326
 Skeham, P. W. 246
 Skinner, J. 167, 171, 177
 Smith, G. A. 88, 200ss.
 —, H. P. 9, 185
 —, J. M. P. 164s., 169
 —, S. 7, 239
 v. Soden, W. 310, 442s.
 v. Sommer 320
 Sonne, I. 189ss., 198
 Speiser, E. A. 10, 442
 Sperling 310
 Spiegelberg, W. 149
 Spiro, S. 338ss.
 Sprey, Th. 445ss.
 Stade 181
 Starcky 358
 Starkey, J. L. 98ss.
 Steindorff, G. 443
 Steinmann, J. 239, 241
 Steinschneider 329
 Stenzel, M. 153
 Stephan 45
 Strack, H. L. 270
 Strack-Billerbeck 400, 409
 Streane 255
 Stuart, M. 275
 Stück 200, 202
 Sturm 7
 Sukenik, E. L. 96, 140, 279, 345, 362, 373s., 393, 411s., 414, 416, 418s.
 —, Y. vid. Y. Yadin
 Sutcliffe, E. F. 313s., 436ss.
 Szyszman, S. 328ss.

 Talmon, S. 156, 206ss.
 Teicher, J. L. 106, 108, 157, 162, 189ss.
 Thackeray, H. St J. 209
 Thompson, G. C. 104
 Thomson, J. G. S. S. 421ss.
 Thureau-Dangin 7
 Torrey, C. C. 83, 154, 242
 Tournay, R. P. 356, 362, 374, 407, 414, 416
 Torczyner, H. vid. Tur-Sinai
 Toy, C. H. 164ss., 170, 172ss.
 Tufnell, O. 97ss.
 Tur-Sinai, H. 88, 320s., 343
 Turner, N. 208ss.

 Umbreit 199, 201s.

 le Vaillant de Florival 145
 de Vaux, R. 125, 444
 Vermès, G. 374, 407, 416
 Vilmar 299
 Vincent, A. 93s.
 Virolleaud, Ch. 219, 441, 443s.
 Viteau, J. 331
 Vogelstein 71
 Volten, A. 151
 Volz, P. 239, 241

 Walker, N. 314s.
 Wallenstein, M. 277ss.
 Ward, W. H. 154
 Weber, F. 429
 Wechter, P. 309
 Wehr, H. 338s., 342, 344
 Weidner 3s., 9
 Weill 94
 Weiser, A. 202
 Welch, A. 326
 Wellhausen, J. 18, 20, 71, 89, 232, 260
 v. Wessetzky, W. 149
 de Wette 203
 Widengren, G. 21
 Wieder, N. 156, 289
 Wiesenberg, E. 284ss.
 Wild, H. 264
 Wildeboer, G. 164, 173
 Wilson, J. A. 3, 6
 — 95s.
 Winter, P. 105ss., 315ss.
 Wood, L. H. 257, 260
 v. d. Woude, A. S. 153s.
 Wreschner 302
 Wright, E. W. 326
 —, G. E. 97ss.
 —, W. 310
 Wünsche, A. 200, 202

 Yadin, Y. 12, 157, 373, 403
 Yalon, H. 125, 156, 159
 Yeivin, S. 1

 Zeitlin, S. 304
 Ziegler, J. 152, 239
 Zimmerli, W. 445ss.
 Zimmern, H. 309, 342, 434
 Zolli, E. 90ss.
 Zorell, F. 214, 352, 357, 405
 Zunz 332

BIBLICAL QUOTATIONS

	P.	<i>Genesis</i>	P.	<i>Exodus</i>	P.	<i>Leviticus</i>	P.
<i>nesis</i>	146, 262	xlii 23	167	xx 12	88	xi-xv	252, 254
s.	438	xlii 33s.	445	xx 19	410	xv 2	205
2, 28	230	xliii 27	439	xxi 2	323, 444	xv 13, 28, 31	257
5	418	xlvi 5, 7	413	xxi 6	444	xvi	252, 324
7	424	xlvi 22	234	xxi 10	204ss.	xvi 29	255
21	422s.	xlvi	33	xxi 36s.	88	xvii 5	73
16	414	xlvi 17	231	xxii 3ss.	88	xvii 7	73, 324
24	438	xlvi 25	314	xxiii 10s.	397	xvii 15s.	252
7	414			xxiii 14-17	52	xviii 6	204
4	415	<i>Exodus</i>		xxiii 15	256	xviii 24-30	252
16	282	iii 6	133	xxiii 16	41, 44	xx 17	400
23	415	iii 11	220	xxiii 18	261	xx 22-25	252
i 13	222	iii 15s.	133	xxvi 1	407	xxi 12	348
1-7	262	vi 20	135	xxviii 4, 43	407	xxii 3-7	253
2-6	394	vii 16	71	xxix 1ss.	409	xxiii	74, 324
21ss.	398	viii 23s.	71	xxix 29	311	xxiii 3	254s.
10	288	x 8	220	xxx 1	364	xxiii 4	251
7	241	x 15	343	xxx 15	325	xxiii 5-8	251
i 9	182	xii 1-14	261s.	xxxi 12-17	262	xxiii 5s.	252, 259
4	288	xii 1-11	65	xxxi 14s.	254s.	xxiii 7s.	254ss.
r 13	444	xii 1	63, 259	xxxii 4	353	xxiii 10-14	251
r 15	409	xii 2	313	xxxii 10s.	397	xxiii 10s.	41
r 20	419	xii 8-10	262	xxxii 16	350	xxiii 10	44, 52
1	130	xii 15-20	251,	xxxii 22	446	xxiii 11	52
12	422s.		258, 262	xxxii 25-29	235	xxiii 12s.	251
i 3	289	xii 15	256	xxxii 26s.	399	xxiii 15-20	251
ii	262	xii 16	254ss., 258	xxxii 32	412	xxiii 15s.	257
ii 7	291	xii 18-20	257	xxxiv	256	xxiii 15	41, 44, 52
ii 8	311	xii 18	256	xxxiv 9	410	xxiii 16s.	52
6	205	xii 19-20	256	xxxiv 18	52, 254	xxiii 20-22	63
ii 6	242	xii 21-23	261	xxxiv 21	57	xxiii 21	251, 255
iv 10	398	xii 22	404	xxxiv 22s.	52	xxiii 24s.	251
iv 62	228	xii 34, 39	261	xxxiv 22	42, 44	xxiii 25	255
iv 63	343s.	xiii 1-16	256	xxxiv 25	261	xxiii 27	251s.
iv 65	343	xiii 21ss.	418	xxxv 1-3	254	xxiii 28-32	251,
v 3	325	xv	23, 26s.	xxxv 2	255		257s.
v 11	228	xv 1-18	134	xxxvii 8	346	xxiii 28, 30	255
vi 7	439	xv 2	133	xxxviii 8	350	xxiii 34-36	251
vi 20	302	xv 13, 16	311	xxxix 4	346	xxiii 35-36	255
viii 10ss.	426	xv 25	235s.	xxxix 6	403	xxiii 36	252
ix 15	323	xvi 35	293	xxxix 28	347	xxiii 37-38	251
x 1	205	xvii 2	236	xl	63	xxiii 39-43	252
xi 7	341	xvii 7	236, 410	xl 2	53, 63	xxiii 39	53
xi 34	280	xviii 2-4	134	xl 17	53	xxiii 40	52, 268,
xii 17	352, 406	xviii 4	133				270
xii 21	325	xviii 5	134	<i>Leviticus</i>		xxiv 5-9	253
xiii 15	229	xviii 7	439	i-vii	254	xxv	74
xiv 2	10	xx 1	286	vii 19-21	252ss.,	xxv 1-14	298
xvii 2	89s.	xx 5	3		256, 258	xxv 3ss.	397
i 15s.	228	xx 10	254	x 1ss.	418	xxv 8ss.	35

	P.		P.		P.		P.
<i>Leviticus</i>		<i>Numbers</i>		<i>Deuteronomy</i>		<i>Joshua</i>	
xxv 8s., 10	322	xxviii 16s.	251,	xx 2	416	x 13	234, 41
xxv 18	257		259	xx 5ss.	410	x 20	39
xxv 20-22	322	xxviii 18, 25	254s.	xx 10-18	10	xi 3	10, 31
xxvi-xxvii	321	xxviii 26	42, 255	xxi 8	325	xi 19	1
xxvi 34s.	298	xxix 1	255	xxi 13	45	xxiv	32
xxvii 1-7	406	xxix 7	255, 257	xxii 12	403	xxiv 11	41
		xxix 12	255	xxiii 10-15	253	xxiv 12	23
		xxix 35	252, 255	xxiii 13-15	352,		
<i>Numbers</i>		xxx 29	45		406	<i>Judges</i>	
i 3s.	397	xxxi 5	351, 400	xxiii 15	410	i 8	9
i 3	406	xxxi 14	397	xxiii 22	88	iii 1-6	23
i 16	397	xxxi 27, 48	397	xxiv 1	410	iii 2	233s
i 46	405	xxxiii 38	287	xxiv 16	3	iv 21	42
i 52	402	xxxvi	321	xxv 4	415	v	2
ii	405			xxvi 5	441	v 5	311s
ii 2ss.	400	<i>Deuteronomy</i>		xxvii 1-8	237s.	v 12	41
iv 3	406	i-xxx	238	xxvii 11ss.	301	v 13	23
vi 1s.	326	i 41, 43	153	xxviii s.	9	v 17	32
viii 7	280	ii 7	398	xxviii 59	221, 282	vi 4ss.	18
viii 24, 26	406	ii 14	293	xxix 9ss.	301	vii 15	43
ix 2-5	262	ii 15	396	xxxi 9-xxxii 47	237s.	vii 16	408s
ix 3	286	iv 29	244	xxxi 10	322	vii 20	40
ix 6-13	252ss., 256s.	v 4ss.	410	xxxii 1-43	238	viii 24	43
		v 9	3	xxxii 13	413	ix 34	40
ix 11s.	262	v 14	254	xxxii 18	231	ix 57	41
ix 13s.	257	v 23	204	xxxii 21	415	xvi 10, 13	34
ix 16s.	418	vii 1	411	xxxii 28	243	xviii 15	43
x 2-10	407	viii 2, 16	236	xxxii 33	280		
x 2	399	ix 27	352	xxxiii	33	<i>1 Samuel</i>	
x 9	410	xi 6	415	xxxiii 6	231	i-xii	32
x 11	53	xii 15, 22	253	xxxiii 8	235s.	i 8	20
xiii 29	319	xiii 9	205	xxxiii 29	108	i 11	43
xiv 37	89	xiv 3-20	253	xxxiv 8	45	i 12	18
xv 1-12	251	xv 1ss.	397	<i>Joshua</i>		i 18	22
xv 32-36	254	xv 2, 7s.	323	i 4	399	i 20	43
xviii 21, 31	363	xv 12, 17	444	ii 22	244	i 26	22
xix	252	xv 22	253	iii 15	91	i 27s.	43
xix 16	414	xvi 1-8	72, 251	iv 24	446	ii 8	41
xxi 14-16	234	xvi 1-3	256	v 10	262	ii 16	184ss
xxi 14	411	xvi 1	259, 261	v 13	410	ii 20	185s
xxi 16-18	280	xvi 2	65, 259, 261	viii 18	358	iv 3	410
xxii 7ss.	426	xvi 3s.	256	viii 24	396	viii 10	43
xxii 33	314	xvi 5-7	52, 65,	viii 26	358	x 2	24
xxiii 24	276		259, 261	viii 30-35	237s.	x 4	43
xxiv	33	xvi 6s.	256	ix 3ss.	9	x 5	18
xxiv 7	325	xvi 8	254	ix 7, 10	10	x 9	18
xxiv 17-19	411	xvi 9-17	72	ix 16	289	x 14, 21	24
xxvi 9	397	xvi 9s.	44	ix 17, 19-21	10	x 24	22
xxvi 59	135	xvi 11, 14-16	52	x 2	10	xi 11	40
xxvii 21	439	xvi 14s.	268	x 11	395	xii 6	8
xxviii-xxix	252	xx 2-4	410			xiii 19ss.	23
xxviii 16-25	65						

	P.		P.		P.		P.
<i>Samuel</i>		<i>2 Samuel</i>		<i>1 Kings</i>		<i>Isaiah</i>	
21	444	xii 8	182	xii 16s.	294ss.	v 5	182
1-35	361	xiii 9	364	xii 16	70, 227	v 7	156, 351
4	354, 357,	xiv 19	228	xiv 5	183	v 8	187
	396	xv 1-6	70	xv 1, 25	287	v 22	152s.
6	358	xv 7	88	xvi 8	287	v 26	415
22	439	xv 21	228	xvi 13, 26	415	v 27	421
23	354, 357,	xvi 16	225	xviii 10	244	vi 3	20
	396	xvii 8	446	xix 12	90	vi 13	369
39	236	xvii 12	413	xx 1ss.	409	vii 11	438
45	358	xvii 20	244	xx 32	230	vii 16s.	181
46s.	411	xix 9-13, 41-44	70	xxii 5ss.	435s.	vii 17	295s.
48	182	xxi-xxiv	326	xxiv 14	73	vii 27	89
55	228	xxi 1-3	8	xxv 11	73	viii 1	353
17	231, 411	xxi 2	9			viii 14	296
3	228	xxi 5s.	253	<i>2 Kings</i>		ix 1ss.	418
12, 19	309	xxi 5	11	ii 2, 4, 6	228	ix 3	219s.
7	222	xxi 14	8	ii 17	244	ix 5	182, 187, 311,
v	228	xxi 22	314	iv 7	88		395, 418
5	439	xxii 12	363	iv 30	228	ix 7	181
20	182	xxii 35	234	vi 5	314	ix 17	343
26	228	xxiii 1-7	33	vi 22	234	ix 18	342s.
28	411	xxiii 7	402	vii 14	405	x 6	349
39	412	xxiii 8ss.	415	viii 12	411	x 26	182
vi	228	xxiv 13	9	ix 10	411	xi	195
12	422s.	xxiv 16ss.	318	ix 24	402	xi 8	182
19	301	xxiv 16, 18	320	xi 12	225	xi 9	283
6	427			xi 14	228	xi 14	393
21	439	<i>1 Kings</i>		xv 13	45	xii 2	370
3	232s.	i	227	xvi 10-16	71	xiii 1, 16, 18	411
		i 3	244	xviii 13	287	xiv 3	187
<i>Samuel</i>		i 25	225	xviii 36	181	xiv 6	351, 409
5	232	i 31	226	xix 17	206ss.	xiv 20	187
7	233	i 34, 38s.	225	xx	168	xv 3	181
8	232ss.	ii 22	439	xx 12	299	xvi 3	281
9	232	ii 31	323	xxiii 1ss.	5	xvi 8	248
22	419	ii 44	412	xxv 2s.	294	xvi 10	187
	323	iii 4ss.	426	xxv 27	286	xvi 12	182
5s.	230	iv 31	19			xvii 13	182
27	228	v 15-25	69	<i>Isaiah</i>		xviii 4	413
25	446	v 17	446	i-xxiii	246	xix 3	156
34	280	vi 1-7	69	i 21ss.	370	xix 8	280
2s.	11	vi 1	287, 297	i 25	371s.	xix 20	182
6-8	94	vi 31, 33	403	i 26	187	xix 21	88
9	99	vi 35	410	ii 1	411	xx 5	182
24	183	vi 46	69	ii 4	234	xxii 7	182
16	182	vii 17	403	iii 7	181	xxv 8	313
23	108	viii 30, 33s.	183	iii 11	187	xxvi 8	369
i	235	viii 37ss.	9	iii 17	301, 369	xxvi 19	424, 430
i 10	439	viii 39	183	iii 18	369	xxvii 6	187
7	439	ix 10	289	iii 24	182	xxviii 7	159, 177s.
11	228	xi 3	87	iv 3, 5	182	xxviii 8, 10	177

<i>Isaiah</i>	P.	<i>Isaiah</i>	P.	<i>Isaiah</i>	P.	<i>Isaiah</i>	P.
xxviii 14	167, 177, 436	xli 21-29	243	xlix 7	109, 187, 241, 243	lvi 1-7	195
xxviii 18	187	xli 25s.	242	xlix 8-12	243	lvi 1	28
xxviii 22	167	xli 29	243	xlix 9	414	lvi 4, 12	18
xxviii 26	280	xlvi 1-4	243, 193	xlix 13	243	lvii 8	3
xxviii 29	181	xlvi 1s.	241, 243	xlix 14	241	lvii 13	18
xxix 3	283	xlvi 5-7	241, 243	xlix 22s.	243	lvii 14	18
xxix 8	431	xlvi 7	414	xlix 23	413	lvii 19	8
xxix 10	422s.	xlvi 10-17	243	xlix 24-26	243	lviii 12	18
xxix 11s., 15	182	xlvi 13	353, 243	xlix 24s.	187	lix 20	37
xxix 20s.	171	xlvi 18-23	243	l 1-3	243	lx 10s.	41
xxix 22	242	xlvi 24	311	l 1	241	lx 11s.	42
xxx 6	279	xlvi 1-7	243	l 3	205	lx 14	41
xxx 10	341	xlvi 3	108	l 4-9, 10-11	243	lx 16	108
xxx 23	182	xlvi 4	181	l 10	372	lx 21	22
xxx 28	363	xlvi 9-13	243	li 1-8	243	lxi	195, 32
xxxi 8	412, 420	xlvi 11	108s.	li 1	368	lxi 3	18
xxxii 5	187	xlvi 14s.	243	li 2	241s.	lxii 2	18
xxxii 7	279	xlvi 16-21	243	li 4-8	366s.	lxii 9	18
xxxiii 6	182	xlvi 20	412	li 5	370	lxii 11	37
xxxiii 9	181	xlvi 21	311	li 6	109	lxiii 8	10
xxxiii 10	275	xlvi 22-28	243	li 7	368	lxiii 14	24
xxxiii 12	182	xlvi 27	168, 435	li 9s.	243	lxv 1	41
xxxiv-lxvi	246	xlvi 1-5, 6-8	243	li 9	313, 368	lxv 8	18
xxxiv 2	181	xlvi 6, 8	109	li 10	368	lxv 9, 15	41
xxxv 8	182, 187	xlvi 20	341	li 12	313	lxvi 2	18
xxxvi 21	181	xlvi 21s.	243	li 17-23	243	lxvi 9	18
xxxvii 18	206ss.	xlvi 23	109, 243	li 17	281, 313	<i>Jeremiah</i>	
xxxviii 11	350	xlvi 24-28	243	li 20	313	i 11s.	15
xxxviii 13	280	xlvi 1-3	243	lii 1	313	ii 19	20
xxxviii 15	281	xlvi 3	241	lii 7-12	243	ii 23	41
xxxviii 21s.	247	xlvi 4-7	243	lii 9s.	108	ii 24	24
xxxix	168	xlvi 4	412	lii 10	243	iv 13	41
xxxix 7	182	xlvi 9s., 11-13, 14-17	243	lii 13-14	243	iv 29	40
xl 1s., 3-5	243	xlvi 15, 17	108	lii 13	181	v 1	24
xl 4	409	xlvi 20-25	243	lii 14	369	v 6	28
xl 6-8, 9-11, 12-18	243	xlvi 21	108	lii 14	195	vi 9	41
xl 19	282	xlvi 22	243	lii 1s.	368	vii 4	313
xl 21-26, 27-31	243	xlvi 24	181	lii 3-6	282	viii 5	41
xl 31	181	xlvi 1s., 3s., 9-11	243	liv 1-3, 4-6	243	ix 7	41
xli 1-29	239	xlvi 10	367	liv 5	109	ix 23	44
xli 1-13	240	xlvi 12s.	243	liv 7s., 9s.	243	xiv 9	41
xli 1-6	243	xlvi 1-15	243	liv 11-17	243	xv 5	43
xli 2s.	242	xlvi 4	109	liv 11-16	193	xv 18	43
xli 8-29	239	xlvi 6	181	liv 17	282	xvi 16	28
xli 8-13	239ss.	xlvi 8	187	lv 1-5	243	xix 8	22
xli 8-10	193	xlvi 12-21	243	lv 3ss.	193	xx 14	23
xli 11-16	242	xlvi 18	184	lv 6s., 8s., 10s.	243	xxiii 19	39
xli 14-16	240, 243	xlvi 20	109, 414	lv 6	244	xxiv 1	27
xli 17-20	240, 243	xlix 1-6	243	lv 12s.	243	xxiv 7	445
		xlix 6	415	lv 12	228	xxix 13	24

	P.		P.		P.		P.
<i>Jeremiah</i>		<i>Ezekiel</i>		<i>Joel</i>		<i>Habakkuk</i>	
xx 11	280	xxxvi 16s.	253	ii 23	119	ii 17	157
xx 23	393	xxxvii 7	204	ii 25	88	ii 18	153
xxi 7	414	xxxvii 15-28	397	iv 7	412	ii 19	154
xxi 33	369	xxxvii 23	253			iii 25, 28, 32	
xxii	321	xxxviii-xxxix	412	<i>Amos</i>		iii 12	206
xxiii 26	242	xxxviii 12s.	349	i 1	411		
xxiv	321	xxxviii 16	446	i 11	438	<i>Zephaniah</i>	
xxiv 9, 14	444	xxxviii 22	412	v 23	20	i 14	353
xxvi 17	438	xxxix 11	414	v 26s.	296	ii 5	393
i 4	287	xxxix 12, 14	253	v 27	126s.		
vi 6	282	xxxix 17	280	viii 9	343	<i>Zechariah</i>	
ix 7	243	xl 1	288, 313	viii 12	244	ix 1	90ss.
ix 17	221	xlii 14	407	viii 14	228	ix 16	437
20	244	xliii 2	53	ix 9	363	xii 6	411
34	349	xliii 3	291	<i>Jonah</i>		xii 10	306
39, 57	423	xliii 11	352	i 5s.	422	xiii 7	306
5s.	294	xliv 16	397	i 9	444	xiv	270
		xliv 19	407	ii 7	279	xiv 16s.	268
<i>Ezekiel</i>		xliv 23	253			<i>Malachi</i>	
7	352	xliv 26	257	<i>Michah</i>		i 7	397
17-21	257	xliv 26	257	i 1	411	i 11	253
4s.	298	xliv 26	257	ii 4	351	i 12	397
5s.	293, 299	xliv 26	257	ii 10	349	iii 2	280
5	292, 294, 297	xliv 26	257	iii 3	204	iii 3	253
11	219	xliv 26	257	iii 11	410		
ii 16	72	xliv 26	257	iv 3	234	<i>Psalms</i>	
	197	xliv 26	257	v 4	311	i 1	176
4	196	xliv 26	257	vi 7	3	ii 8	206
15	302	xliv 26	257	vi 9	219	iii 6	423
v 7	183	xliv 26	257	vii 2	243	iii 8	278
v 21	9	xliv 26	257	vii 11	161	iv 4	282
vi 5	415	xliv 26	257	vii 18	414	iv 7	437
vi 26	205	xliv 26	257			iv 9	423
vii 2	3	xliv 26	257	<i>Nahum</i>		vii 3	282
viii 30	279	xliv 26	257	i 13	219	vii 7	275, 415
x 14	219	xliv 26	257	i 15	88	viii 6	415
x 35	394	xliv 26	257	iii 10	411	ix 16	311
x 37	350	xliv 26	257			x 4, 9	281
xi 3	346	xliv 26	257	<i>Habakkuk</i>		xii 7	282
xii 26	253	xliv 26	257	i 1	411	xii 8	311
xii 30	244	xliv 26	257	i 9	154	xiii 4	423
xiii 20	205	xliv 26	257	i 11	158, 312	xvi	327
xiv 13	253	xliv 26	257	i 12	280	xvi 2	89
xv 14	446	xliv 26	257	ii 3	159	xvii 12	353
xvi 21	244	xliv 26	257	ii 5	152s.	xviii	327
xvii 7	222	xliv 26	257	ii 6	178	xviii 35	234
xx 18	219s.	xliv 26	257	ii 15	155	xix	22
xxi 3	415	xliv 26	257	ii 16	158	xxii 3	90
xxiii 1-9	257	xliv 26	257			xxii 14	281
xxiii 24	241	xliv 26	257				
xxiv 13	419	xliv 26	257				

<i>Psalms</i>	P.	<i>Psalms</i>	P.	<i>Psalms</i>	P.	<i>Job</i>	P.
xxii 26	88	lxx 5	370	cxviii 27	267s.	xli 8	352
xxii 27	231	lxxiii	29	cxviii 29	270	xli 21	359
xxv	327	lxxiii 20	431	cxix 51	165	<i>Proverbs</i>	
xxv 17	282	lxxiv	18, 25	cxix 175	230	i 6	17
xxvii	327	lxxvi 4	234	cxxi 4	421	i 22	172
xxix	23, 28	lxxvi 7	422	cxix 5	280	ii 4s.	24
xxxi	327	lxxvii	28s.	cxixvi 1	431	iii 34	160
xxxi 6	425	lxxvii 19	395	cxixvii 3	438	vii 14	88
xxxiv 7	311	lxxviii 20, 25, 27	204	cxixxix 18	424, 426	viii 31	419
xxxiv 15	90	lxxix	18	cxlii 5	243	ix 7s.	172s.
xxxv 3	359	lxxix 3	411	cxliii 3	283	ix 12	164, 430
xxxv 8	311	lxxxi	30	cxliv 1	234	x 5	422
xxxvi	327	lxxxi 6	437	cxliv 2	275	x 18	90
xxxvii 2	417	lxxxiii	18	<i>Job</i>		x 31	89
xxxvii 32	203	lxxxviii	32	ii 9	323	xii 14	89
xxxvii 36	244	lxxxviii 1	19	iv 13	422	xiii 1-3	17
xxxviii 10	281	lxxxviii 16	221	vi 11	161	xiii 1	170
xxxix 3	90	lxxxix	25, 32	vii 14	431	xiii 2	89
xli 4	221	xc 4	287	ix 12	281	xiii 12	160
xliv	18	xc 5	424	x 22	352	xiv 4	283
xlv 10	86	xcii-xcvi	28	xi 15	173	xiv 6	170, 172
xlvi 3	25	xcii	29	xii 22	410	xiv 9	172
xlvi 12	420	xciii	29	xiii 27	410	xiv 34	400
xlx 2	350	xciv	29s., 155	xiv 10-12	423	xv 12	171, 172
xlx 15	352	xciv 11	446	xiv 13	161	xvii 3	283
l 14	88	xciv 17	154	xv 30	346	xviii 20	89
li 3ss.	30	xcv	30s., 155	xvi 19	169	xix 15	422
li 3s.	176	xcv 17	154	xvi 20	163, 169	xix 17	89
lv 10	156	xcvi	31	xvi 21	169	xix 25	171s.
lv 16	280	xcvii 4	395	xix 15	204	xix 28	165, 170ss.
lvi 9	281	xcvii 8	420	xx 8	431	xix 29	170, 172
lvii 5	279s.	civ	25s.	xx 26	231	xx 1	167, 176ss.
lix 4	282	civ 21	278	xxi 33	281	xx 27	430
lx	18	civ 29	282	xxi 34	415	xxi 11	17
lx 1s.	235	cv 39	410	xxii 26	88	xxi 23s.	171, 172
lxi 9	88	cv 43	412	xxiii 3	160	xxii 10	17
lxii 2	90	cvi 5	412	xxiii 9, 11	230	xxiv 9	17
lxiii	327	cvi 43	221	xxiv 4	281	xxiv 25	41
lxiv 2	90	cvii 29	283	xxiv 14	231	xxv 10	400
lxiv 4	282	cx	18	xxvii 2	228	xxvi 18	34
lxv 2	88	cx 3	406	xxix 3	416	xxix 8	17
lxvi 13	88	cxv 2	417	xxx 6	409	xxx 14	28
lxvii	28s.	cxvi 14, 18	88	xxx 23	400	xxx 30	28
lxviii	14, 28, 204	cxvii 16	31	xxxi 7	173	<i>Ruth</i>	
lxviii 3	203s.	cxviii	31	xxxiii 15	421s.	i 8	23
lxviii 5	25	cxviii 1-4	270	xxxiii 23	163, 169	i 17	31
lxviii 9	311	cxviii 4	271	xxxiv 3	90	iii 4	18
lxviii 19	92	cxviii 15s.	28	xxxiv 14s.	424	iii 9	20
lxix 11	221	cxviii 17, 24	266	xxxvi 30	410	iv 15	27
lxix 29	412	cxviii 25, 28, 266ss.		xxxvi 32	417		
lxix 33	231	cxviii 26	267				

	P.		P.		P.		P.
<i>Song of Songs</i>		<i>Daniel</i>		<i>Nehemiah</i>		<i>2 Chronicles</i>	
i 4	402	vi 8, 13	45	iii	96	xxxi 2	399
ii 1s.	244	vi 19	437	v	321, 323	xxxii 31	168
ii 8	234	vi 22	226	vi 1	104	xxxiv 8	290
v 8	158	vi 27	226, 228	vi 19	90	xxxv 12	364
v 15	280	vii	274, 276	vii 64	244	xxxv 19	287
v 6	244	vii 14	420	viii 13-18	252	xxxvi 11-20	294
vi 8	87	viii 14	287	ix-x	301	xxxvi 21	298s.
vii 10	89	viii 18	422	xii	96	xxxvi 22	291
		viii 24	410	xiii 9, 22	253		
<i>Ecclesiastes</i>		ix 24-26	287	xiii 28	263	<i>Matthew</i>	
v 2	431	x 9	422	xiii 30	253	xxvi 52	360
v 3	88	x 11	413				
v 6	431	x 13, 21	409	<i>1 Chronicles</i>		<i>Mark</i>	
v 13	244	xi 6ss., 11, 13	394	ii 6	19	xiv 41	160ss.
vi 6	287	xi 15-17	186	iv 39s.	244		
vii 28	244	xi 15	183, 394	xii 1-4	11	<i>Luke</i>	
viii 17	244	xi 16-18	183s.	xii 38	280	viii 55	425
x 6	244	xi 22, 28	413	xii 39	287	xxii 31	363
xii 10	244	xi 30	410	xiv 15	183	xxiii 30	419
		xi 32, 40	394	xvi 13	412		
<i>Lamentations</i>		xii 1	409s., 412	xxi 15	318	<i>John</i>	
17	288	xii 2	423, 430	xxi 27	360	xi 11	425
i 17	394	xii 7	228, 412	xxiii 4	407	xviii 11	360
ii 23	424, 431	xii 11s.	287	xxiii 27	406		
v 6	393					<i>Romans</i>	
v 9	340			<i>2 Chronicles</i>		xi 25	414
		<i>Ezra</i>		iii 1	318	xvi 25	414
<i>Esther</i>		i 1	291	iii 2	297		
i 23	244	ii 62	244	vi	183	<i>Ephesians</i>	
v 11	45	iii 8	291	viii 1	289	i 9s.	414
v 14	406	vi 3	216	x 16s.	294ss.	iii 9	414
		vi 13-22	63	xi 5-12	99		
<i>Daniel</i>		vi 19-22	252	xi 16s.	294, 297	<i>Colossians</i>	
12, 14s.	287	viii 15	287	xi 17	287	i 26	414
i	274, 276	viii 22	279	xii 5	279		
i 1	437	viii 32	287	xv 2	244	<i>1 Peter</i>	
i 4	226	ix 8	413	xv 10	287	v 5	166
ii 9	226	ix 13	220	xv 15	244		
ii 25	350			xix 10	257	<i>Revelation</i>	
ii 29	216	<i>Nehemiah</i>		xx 7	242	vi 16	419
v 2s.	84s.	i 1	260, 294	xx 9	183	vii 2s.	197
v 10	226	ii 1	260, 294	xxi 19	287	xi 4	197
v 23	84s.	ii 3	225	xxiii 11	225	xiv 1	197
vi 3-5	405	ii 6	86	xxix 17	287	xxii 3s.	197
vi 7	226	ii 11	287	xxx	253		

